

ALCUIN CLUB COLLECTIONS
No. XLV

BX
5141
.A1
A6
no. 45

Sr

THE INFLUENCE OF THE SYNAGOGUE UPON THE DIVINE OFFICE

BY

C. W. DUGMORE, D.D.

*Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the
University of London*



THE FAITH PRESS LTD
7 Tufton Street, Westminster, S.W.1

First published by Oxford University Press
1944

This Edition The Faith Press Ltd
1964

© C. W. Dugmore

Theology Library
**SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT**
California

Printed by The Faith Press Ltd
Leighton Buzzard, Beds

P R E F A C E

IT is now twenty years since the first edition of this work was published by the Oxford University Press and the book has long been out of print. Enquiries for it which have reached me from time to time suggest that there is still a call for it and, indeed, it is remarkable how few studies of the subject have appeared in the interval. Numerous monographs have appeared, such as J. M. Hanssens, *Nature et Genèse de l'Office des Matines* (Rome 1952); A. Allan McArthur, *The Evolution of the Christian Year* (London 1953); Anton Baumstark, *Nocturna Laus* (Münster 1957) and Willy Rordorf, *Der Sonntag* (Zürich 1962), to name but a few—not to mention the specialist works of Cullmann, Capelle, Botte, Jeremias and Aland, which have been mainly concerned with Baptism and the Eucharist. But no single work has appeared which has treated the present subject as a whole. Dom Benedict Steuart, in his *The Development of Christian Worship* (London 1953), did the present writer the honour of referring extensively to and endorsing the conclusions reached in the following pages. The author can, therefore, only express his gratitude to the Alcuin Club for their suggestion that they should publish a reprint of the 1944 edition of this work, and his hope that it will reach a wider public than was possible in the case of the first, rather limited (war-time), edition.

The original preface was necessarily 'dated' and has been omitted. The 'Introduction,' which has also been omitted, drew attention to the older emphasis on the influence of the Mystery Religions and of Hellenism upon the worship and theology of the primitive Church, and sought to redress the balance of this nineteenth-century approach (whilst recognizing the contribution of Greece) by stressing the influence of Judaism and, especially, of the Synagogue to the development of early Christian worship. This view has found increasing support in the intervening years. Had the opportunity (and the time) presented itself for the author to rewrite the whole book, he might have modified his conclusions on certain details, such as the primitive observance of the 'Lord's Day' (Sunday)—see his more recent treatment of the

subject in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (Leiden 1962)—but in regard to the Church's debt to the Synagogue in the realm of worship, the times of public prayer (*ingressu lucis et noctis*, according to Tertullian) derived from the old Temple worship *via* the Synagogue, the content of the early Christian services, and the development of the monastic Hours, he would not wish to change what he wrote in a country rectory while German bombers flew overhead in the early days of World War II. At least there was leisure, in those circumstances, to read, ponder, check and re-check one's references in the intervals between Air Raid duty and parochialia. In a modern university such days seem to belong to the age of Dr. Samuel Johnson.

C. W. DUGMORE

*University of London,
King's College*

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
I. THE EARLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY	1
1. The Break with Judaism	1
2. The Development of Worship	7
II. THE SERVICES OF THE SYNAGOGUE	11
1. Growth of the Liturgy	11
2. The <i>Shema'</i> and its Blessings	16
3. The Daily Blessings (' <i>Amīdāh</i>)	22
III. THE CHRISTIAN WEEK	26
1. The Lord's Day	26
2. The Sabbath	28
3. Station Days	37
4. Daily Services	42
IV. GROWTH OF THE CANONICAL HOURS	59
V. THE PRO-ANAPHORA: THE EARLY OUT-LINE	71
VI. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRO-ANAPHORA IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES	90
VII. THE JEWISH CONTRIBUTION TO THE PRO-ANAPHORA	102
VIII. CONCLUSION	111
APPENDIX. Text of the <i>Shemōneh 'Esrēh</i> or ' <i>Amīdāh</i> '	114
GLOSSARY	129
SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
INDEX I. Biblical References	137
II. Patristic Literature	139
III. Rabbinic References	146
IV. Subjects and Names	147

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Apoc. N.T.</i>	<i>The Apocryphal New Testament</i> , ed. M. R. James. Oxford 1924.
b.	Babylonian Talmud.
<i>Dict. Chr. Antiq.</i>	<i>A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities</i> , ed. W. Smith and S. Cheetham. 2 vols. London 1893.
<i>Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i> , ed. F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq. Paris 1907- .
<i>Griech. Christ. Schrift.</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i> . Berlin and Leipzig, 1897- .
<i>H.D.B.</i>	<i>A Dictionary of the Bible</i> , ed. J. Hastings. 4 vols. 1898-1902. Extra vol. 1904.
j.	Jerusalem Talmud.
<i>J.E.</i>	<i>The Jewish Encyclopedia</i> . 12 vols. New York 1901-6.
<i>J.Q.R.</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> .
<i>J.T.S.</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> .
<i>L.E.W.</i>	<i>Liturgies Eastern and Western</i> , F. E. Brightman. Vol. 1, Eastern. (All published.) Oxford 1896.
<i>M.G.W.J.</i>	<i>Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums</i> . Leipzig and (later) Dresden and Breslau 1851- .
P.G.	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne.
P.L.	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne.
<i>R.E.J.</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i> . Paris 1880- .
Targ. Jon.	Targum Jonathan.
Targ. Onk.	Targum Onkelos.
Toş.	Toşefta.
Singer.	<i>The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire</i> , ed. S. Singer. 14th ed. London 1929.
<i>Z.N.T.W.</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> . Giessen 1900- .

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

1. *The Break with Judaism*

JEWISH and Christian worship spring from a common fount. Over and over again we read in the Gospels of Jesus' presence in the Synagogue, both on weekdays and on the Sabbath.¹ In the Acts of the Apostles we have abundant evidence that the Apostles followed his example. At first the embryo Church centred in Jerusalem, and during the expansion of the Church after the death of Stephen 'almost the whole administration originated from the Jerusalem Church, in which the authority and domination of the Judaizers, as they are called, far exceeded the influence of the Hellenists'.² In fact, the first followers of Jesus continued to join in the worship of the Synagogue and to keep *Tōrāh*. They formed, as it were, a new sect or party (*aipeiros*, according to Acts xxiv. 14) within Judaism, differing from their orthodox Jewish friends only in their acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, just as the Pharisees were a party differing in their belief in the Resurrection from the more conservative body of the Sadducees.³

When Christianity spread to the cities of the Dispersion, it was to the synagogues that the emissaries of the Jerusalem Church naturally went, in the first instance.⁴ If the Temple was still the focus of Jewish religion and national aspiration, the Synagogue had already become the centre

¹ Mk. i. 21, vi. 2 (cf. Mt. xiii. 54); Mt. iv. 23 (cf. Mk. i. 39; Lk. iv. 44), ix. 35; Lk. iv. 15, 16, vi. 6 (cf. Mk. iii. 1; Mt. xii. 9), xiii. 10-17; Jn. vi. 59, xviii. 20. The text of the Synoptic passages is printed in parallel columns in D. A. Huck, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (Tübingen 1931).

² Cabrol and Leclercq, *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Liturgica* (Paris 1900-2), vol. i, p. xvi.

³ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), vol. i, pp. 90-2, 108; Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Macmillan 1920), vol. i, pp. 300 et seq.

⁴ Acts xiii. 5, 14, xiv. 1, xvii. 2, 10, 17, xviii. 4, 19, xix. 8.

of Jewish worship, life, and thought, wherever there were Jews, by the time of Jesus. Forty years after his death the Temple was destroyed by the Romans, and was never rebuilt. But Judaism did not perish with it: it continued to flourish in the towns and villages of the Dispersion as well as in Galilee and other parts of Palestine. For the Synagogue has always been not only a 'house of Prayer' but also a 'house of Study' (*Bēth ha-Midrāsh*); not only a parish church, but also a parochial hall.

The Temple worship, then, is likely to have left little mark upon Christian worship when the latter began to develop along lines of its own. But if the first Christians attended the Synagogue, as we know they did, and continued to worship according to the liturgy of the Synagogue, the question arises, How much of that liturgy, if any, did they take with them into the distinctively Christian gatherings which took the place of Synagogue worship for them, when anathemas and hostile public opinion prevented them from joining in the worship of their Jewish friends and founders?

At the death of Paul Christianity was still a Jewish sect. In the middle of the second century it is a separate religion busily engaged in apologetics to the Greek and Roman world.¹ Thus the official break between the two parties within Judaism must have taken place within that period. It is not the purpose of this chapter to discuss the causes of that separation. Briefly, they were three: the growing tension between the two parties regarding the literal observance of the written Law, the inclusion in the Synagogue liturgy about the year A.D. 90 of a declaration about heretics so worded that the Jewish-Christians could not pronounce it, and the question of the Messiahship of Jesus.

As the Rabbinical leaders at Jabneh well knew, there were very many Jewish-Christians who continued to ob-

¹ James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (London 1934), p. 77.

serve the Law. But converts from the Graeco-Roman world already formed a large body of Gentile Christians who did not observe the Law at all. While the orthodox party at Jabneh might have been quite willing to continue in friendly contact with the former, they could not but refuse to accept the latter. There were already, from their point of view, heresies enough abroad in the land. It was high time the orthodox Faith was proclaimed anew, and that men were recalled to the Law of God.

With the object of achieving greater unity among the orthodox and of detecting heresy, a new declaration about heretics was inserted in the daily Blessings (*Shemōneh 'Esrēh*) recited in the Synagogue. Composed by Samuel the Small, a contemporary of Gamaliel II who presided at Jabneh from A.D. 80 to A.D. 110, the twelfth Benediction (*Birkath ha-Minim*) was so worded that Jewish-Christians and Gnostics alike would find themselves unable to recite it. Dr. Parkes¹ is unaware of the wording of the original Benediction. Israel Abrahams² remarks that there is no foundation whatever for the statement which originated with Justin Martyr that the paragraph is an imprecation against Christians. But it is difficult to see how this view can be maintained, for the statement of Jerome³ that it contained the express condemnation of 'Nazareens'—a

¹ Op. cit., p. 78.

² *A Companion to the Authorised Daily Prayer Book* (London 1922), p. lxiv. The passage to which he referred is, presumably: Καταράμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστόν κ.τ.λ., Justin, *Dialog. c. Tryph.* xvi: P.G. vi. 512.

³ In *Isaiam* v. 18; P.L. xxiv. 87: *ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazarenorum anathematizent vocabulum Christianum.* Cf. ibid. xlix. 7; P.L. xxiv. 484: and ibid. lli. 4 seq. (*Judaei*) diebus ac noctibus blasphemant Salvatorem, et sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazarenorum, ter in die in Christianos congerunt maledicta. Epiphanius, also, remarks: Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους κέκτηνται μῆσος, δὲλλὰ καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι ἔωθεν καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐσπέραν, τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὅτε εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἔαυτοῖς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζονται τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας φάσκοντες ὅτι Ἐπικαταράσσου ὁ θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους: *Adv. Haer. (Panarion)* xxix. 9; ed. K. Holl, vol. i, pp. 331–2 in *Griech. Christ. Schrift.* which provides a better text than P.G. xli. 404–5.

word which could only apply to Jewish-Christians—has been proved up to the hilt by the discovery of the original Palestinian text of the malediction in a fragment from the Genizah at Fustat. It runs as follows:

'For apostates let there be no hope, and the dominion of arrogance do Thou speedily root out in our days: and let Christians¹ and heretics perish as in a moment, let them be blotted out of the book of the living and let them not be written with the righteous. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.'²

Any Jewish-Christian invited to pronounce the *She-môneh 'Esreh* would inevitably omit or alter this particular section when he came to it. The inclusion of this malediction in the service was, thus, a direct challenge to the members of the new party within the Synagogue.

But it seems likely that it was not until the war of Bar Cochba in A.D. 135 that the final breach with orthodox Judaism occurred.³ That there was a definite break at this time is suggested by the following passage in Eusebius:⁴

'The chronology of the bishops of Jerusalem I have nowhere found preserved in writing, for tradition says that they were all short-lived. But I have learned this much from writings, that until the siege of the Jews which took place under Hadrian [in A.D. 135],

והנוצרים והמינים ברגע יאבדו ימחו מספר חיים ועם צדיקים אל יכתבו :
... ב' א' יי'. The reading is also found in the Oxford MS. of the *Seder R. 'Amrām* (cf. Finkelstein's textual notes, *J.Q.R.* (New Series), vol. xvi, p. 156). According to Strack (*Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Eng. tr. Philadelphia 1931, p. 306 note 6), Professor Marx found the reading **לטזרים** in the Oxford MS. His own words clearly show that Strack has here made a slip. 'Ich will an dieser Stelle die Lesart **יכלו כרגע** *hervorheben*, die Krauss (*J.Q.R.* V. 133) aus Citaten bei den Kirchenvätern erschloss und Schechter (*J.Q.R.* X. 657) in einem eine palästinensische Version enthaltenden Genizafragmente entdeckte. Dazu tritt nun O [= Bodl. MS. Opp. Add. Q 28 (Neubauer 1095)] als ein weiterer Zeuge': A. Marx, 'Untersuchungen zum Siddur des R. Amram' in *Jahrbuch der jüdisch-literarischen Gesellschaft*, vol. v (1907), p. 353.

² Edited by Schechter in *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. x, p. 657.

³ Parkes, op. cit., pp. 78–9. Justin Martyr (*Dialog. c. Tryph.* xlvii; P.G. vi. 576) is a witness that even in the second century there were some who thought it possible to keep the law of circumcision, &c., and at the same time to be a Christian, while others held a contrary opinion.

⁴ *Hist. Eccl.* iv. v. 1–2; P.G. xx. 309.

there were fifteen bishops in succession there, all of whom are said to have been of Hebrew descent. . . . For their whole church consisted then of believing Hebrews who continued from the days of the Apostles until the siege which took place at this time. . . . But since the bishops of the circumcision ceased at this time, it is proper to give here a list of their names from the beginning.'

And in another passage¹ he states:

'We have shown that from that time first the church in Jerusalem was composed of Gentiles, after those of the circumcision, and that Marcus was the first Gentile bishop who presided over them.'

Thus the official break between the two parties within Judaism took place between A.D. 90 and A.D. 135, and more probably towards the close of this period than at its beginning. Yet it would be a mistake to imagine that the influence of the early 'Christian' community within Judaism ceased after A.D. 135. We learn from Epiphanius² that the Ebionites had numerous communities scattered throughout Syria, the Decapolis, the island of Cyprus, and even as far east as Mesopotamia. They continued to have synagogues and elders, exactly like the Jews.³ Nor was the use of the word 'synagogue' confined to the Jewish-Christians of Palestine and the neighbouring countries. From one of the Apocryphal Acts, written perhaps c. A.D. 200,⁴ we learn that at Rome the place of Christian assembly was called a 'synagogue'. Irenaeus also speaks of the Church as the *synagoga Dei*,⁵ in which he complains of 'presbyters . . . [who] are puffed up with the pride of holding the chief seat'.⁶ Ignatius urges all to reverence the presbyters as 'the sanhedrim of God and assembly of the Apostles'.⁷

¹ *Ibid.* v. xii. 1; P.G. xx. 457. Cf. *ibid.* iv. vi. 4; P.G. xx. 316. At an earlier period Irenaeus claimed to be able to reckon up the direct succession to his own time (*Adv. Haer.* III. iii. 1; P.G. vii. 848).

² *Adv. Haer. (Panarion)* xxx. 18; P.G. xli. 436.

³ *Ibid.* συναγωγὴν δὲ οὐνοι καλοῦσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν.

⁴ *Acts of Peter* (The Vercelli Acts, ix); ed. M. R. James in *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 313.

⁵ *Adv. Haer.* III. vi. 1; P.G. vii. 861.

⁶ *Ibid.* IV. xxvi. 3; P.G. vii. 1054.

⁷ *Ad Trall.* iii. 1; P.G. v. 780: ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ καὶ σύνδεσμος ἀποστόλων.

But the organization and worship of the early Church were not merely imitative of the Synagogue. From the first, they developed along lines of their own. There was a new emphasis, to accord with the 'new covenant', and unhappily bitterness crept in with regard to the 'old covenant' at an early date. Already in the first century the *Epistle of Barnabas* was an exposition of the Church as the true Israel. In the first decade of the second century Ignatius wrote in these strenuous terms:

'If anyone propound Judaism to you, hear him not; for it is better to hear Christianity from a man who is circumcised, than Judaism from one uncircumcised. But if either the one or the other speak not concerning Jesus Christ, I look on them as tombstones and graves of the dead, whereon are inscribed only the names of men.'¹

Moreover, the early Christians added another element to their life and worship, derived directly from Jesus. This was the perpetuation, in prayer and the breaking of bread, of the experience of the Upper Room. It is not the purpose of this book to discuss the origin of the Eucharist, nor to trace in detail the development of the Canon. But wherever there have been Christians there the Eucharist has been celebrated with bread and wine, throughout the centuries. In the East it has never been usual to celebrate the Eucharist daily, but in the West the custom arose in North Africa in the time of Cyprian and rapidly spread through the whole of the Western Church. This fact, together with the special importance which has always attached to the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, may account for the general neglect of the other services of the early Church. It may, indeed, come as a surprise to some that there were any non-eucharistic services before the rise of monasticism and the introduction of the Canonical Hours.

¹ *Ad Philad.* vi. 1 (ed. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, vol. ii, p. 263); P.G. v. 701.

2. *The Development of Worship*

After the Ascension the Apostles remained for a time in Jerusalem 'all together attending the Place of Prayer'.¹ From the context of these words it would seem that the 'Place of Prayer' was the Upper Room to which they returned from the Mount of Olives. That the followers of Jesus should form themselves into a *συναγωγή* would have occasioned little comment among their Jewish friends. They continued also to attend the worship in the Temple,² and that would have been sufficient to allay any suspicion of heresy, at least for a time. In any case, whether the Apostles formed a quorum (*minyan*) and recited prayers in the Upper Room, or whether they attended the local synagogue of the quarter in which they were living in Jerusalem, it was the liturgy of the Synagogue rather than the worship of the Temple which moulded the services of the early Christian community.³ It was at a synagogue, or synagogues, in Jerusalem that Stephen roused the hostility of his hearers.⁴ It was to the synagogue at Damascus that Saul went, seeking the followers of the Way,⁵ and there he proclaimed Jesus immediately after his conversion.⁶ Throughout his subsequent missionary journeys Paul was scrupulously careful to attend the services of the Synagogue,⁷ and although the number of Gentile converts was gradually increased, these were largely drawn from the ranks of the 'god-fearers', who had 'adopted the Jewish form of worship . . . and frequented the Jewish synagogues, but confined themselves with regard to the ceremonial law to certain cardinal points'.⁸

As we might expect, then, there are numerous allusions

¹ Acts i. 14. See the note on *τῇ προσευχῇ* in Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, op. cit., vol. iv, p. 10. ² Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, iv. 2, v. 21, 25, 42.

³ Duchesne, *Christian Worship* (Eng. tr.), p. 46. ⁴ Acts vi. 9 et seq.

⁵ Acts ix. 2.

⁶ Acts ix. 20.

⁷ Acts xiii. 14, xvii. 10, xix. 8.

⁸ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, ed. 4, vol. iii, p. 173 et seq., quoted and endorsed by Kirsopp Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (London 1911), pp. 38, 39.

to Synagogue usage in the pages of the New Testament. We have seen that Paul, like his Master before him, was careful to attend the synagogue services wherever he went. In one of his epistles he enjoins prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings.¹ In the same and other epistles he commands his hearers to continue the Synagogue practice of Scripture lections, exhortation, and teaching.² The use of psalms and hymns was likewise taken over into the early Christian assemblies.³ In short, we are forced to conclude that the Synagogue worship was the norm of Christian worship in the days of the Apostles, even to the response 'Amen' by the people at the close of every thanksgiving.⁴ Men and women were separated as in the synagogues, but the men were bareheaded and the women veiled.⁵ The attitude of prayer was standing.⁶

If, then, Synagogue worship was the norm of early Christian worship, it is natural to ask whether all trace of its influence disappeared later. To object that this influence was purely ephemeral lays the onus of proof on the objector. There is, too, another question of crucial importance. What was the relation of the liturgy of the Synagogue to the liturgy of the Upper Room in the fully developed service of the Church?

In the Acts and in one of Paul's epistles, in addition to the facts which we have noted, there is mention of the 'breaking of bread'.⁷ This has been taken to refer to the Eucharist. Whether in fact the 'breaking of bread' was always a celebration of the Eucharist or sometimes denotes the Agape, is a question outside the scope of this study. That the commemoration of the Last Supper with bread and wine was from the first the hall-mark of Christians seems certain. It was something sacred to them, and peculiar to them. But there is no evidence to show that the Eucharist was

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 1. ² 1 Tim. iv. 13; 1 Thess. v. 27; 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

³ Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16. ⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 16. ⁵ 1 Cor. xi. 6, 7.

⁶ Phil. i. 27; Eph. vi. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8.

⁷ Acts ii. 42, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 16.

celebrated daily before the time of Cyprian (*c.* A.D. 240). Acts (xx. 7) speaks of a gathering 'on the first day of the week' at which Paul discoursed at some length and then 'broke bread' after midnight. The Eucharistic passage 1 Cor. xi. 20-9 tells us nothing about the time at which the service was held. From Pliny's letter¹ to the emperor Trajan (A.D. 112) we learn that the Christians in Bithynia met together for two separate rites on a 'fixed day' (*stato die*) which is generally accepted to have been Sunday. The first of these rites took place 'before it was light' (*ante lucem*), 'when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ etc.' The second rite consisted in reassembling to partake of food, 'but food of an ordinary and innocent kind'. Without further evidence we have no means of deciding whether this meal was a Eucharist or an Agape. Woolley² speaks of a 'Sunday morning service taken into Christian usage from the Jews', and suggests that the two rites described by Pliny correspond to the later Pro-Anaphora and Anaphora of the Eastern Church liturgy. It is, indeed, a commonly accepted theory that the Eucharistic liturgy is derived from a combination of the liturgy of the Synagogue and the liturgy of the Upper Room.³ Srawley recognizes the original distinctness of the two services, and yet confesses himself quite unable to trace 'the fusion of the two elements'.⁴ None of these writers shows any inclination to regard the two services as having been sometimes separate and sometimes taken together. Most of the writers on the subject seem quite unaware that the Sabbath morning service of the Synagogue was, and still is, simply an expanded version of the daily morning prayer. If the first Christians followed the customary cycle of readings and prayers on Sabbaths, it is, to say the least,

¹ Ep. x. xcvi (*ad Trajan.*). The passage was quoted by Tertullian (*Apol.* ii; P.L. i. 321).

² *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church* (Cambridge 1910), p. 34.

³ Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship* (Oxford 1936), p. 5.

⁴ *The Early History of the Liturgy* (Cambridge 1913), pp. 197-8.

probable that they followed the Synagogue liturgy on weekdays also. Cabrol, it is true, recognizes not only the connexion between the Sabbath morning Synagogue liturgy and the Mass of the Catechumens; he goes so far as to say that 'there were among the Christians of the first three centuries, beyond the Eucharistic synax, other gatherings which were aliturgical, and which must be distinguished from the Mass, although in many cases the aliturgical synax was followed by the Eucharist'.¹ Lietzmann rightly notes that 'in the earliest period the Eucharist belongs to the late afternoon hours. . . . By about the middle of the second century the sacramental meal has developed into an independent rite and has been transferred to Sunday morning and joined with the service of reading and preaching'.² But even here there is no realization of the fundamental importance of the daily prayer, morning and evening, in the life of the primitive Christian community. It must be a matter of considerable interest to every student of early Christian worship to know what happened to the liturgy of the Synagogue, which undoubtedly provided the ordinary vehicle of prayer for Jesus, Paul, and the first disciples. Was it entirely swallowed up in the rapidly developing service of the Eucharist, so that it formed merely the prelude to the Anaphora, or Canon of the Mass? Or did it also exist for several centuries as a non-eucharistic service in the Church?

Before attempting to trace this legacy of the Jewish Christian Church through the centuries of Church History which precede the crystallization of the liturgies of Byzantium, of Rome, the Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies, it will be as well for us to get as clear an idea as possible, within the limits imposed by space, of what constituted the Synagogue worship in the first century A.D.

¹ Cabrol, *The Mass of the Western Rites* (London 1934), p. 14.

² See his essay on 'The Christian Church in the West' in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xii, chap. xv, pp. 523-4.

CHAPTER II

THE SERVICES OF THE SYNAGOGUE

1. *Growth of the Liturgy*

'THE Jewish religious service falls, generally, into two main divisions—instruction and prayer. This division of the service has existed from the earliest times.'¹ It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that there is one single 'Jewish religious service' *par excellence*, comparable to the service of the Eucharist in the Christian Church.

The modern English edition of the Jewish Prayer Book most frequently referred to by writers on the liturgy is that of S. Singer (*The Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, London 1891 and repeatedly since).² It needs but a cursory glance at this service-book to discover that in addition to the three daily services (morning, afternoon, and evening) the Jewish liturgy includes services for the Inauguration of the Sabbath, for Sabbath morning, afternoon, and evening, for the going-out of Sabbath (*Habhdālāh*), for the sanctification of Sabbath and the festivals through a blessing said over wine and bread (*Kiddūsh*), and for Grace before and after meals. All the great festivals of the year also have their special prayers and lections.

Only after centuries of gradual growth and development did the Synagogue evolve these elaborate forms of service, so that we find in the modern Prayer Book ancient Hebrew psalms, and Talmudic prayers and benedictions, interspersed with later religious poems (*Piyyūtīm*) and even sixteenth-century additions. But the essential characteristics of the early services of the Synagogue remained the

¹ Blau, *J.E.*, vol. viii, p. 132, where O.T. references are given illustrating this twofold division.

² This edition follows the Ashkenazic (Northern French and German) use. The best modern edition of the Sephardic (Spanish and Portuguese) use is that of D. A. de Sola (London 1836-8) revised by M. Gaster (London 1901-4).

framework to which these later portions were added. No attempt at replacing ancient prayers by later compositions can be traced until quite recent times.

The first part of the Prayer Book (Singer, pp. 1-37) does not belong to the Synagogue service proper. It is private material consisting of blessings on certain acts, such as the putting on of the girdle and clothes, together with certain psalms of praise and the Song of Moses, which are included here in the public Morning Prayer in case the individual has not yet recited them. It contains late hymns such as *Yigdal*¹ and '*Adōn 'Olām*,² though many of the early morning Benedictions are already cited in the Talmud.³

Public worship begins with the invocation 'Bless ye the Lord who is to be blessed',⁴ which is the same for the morning and evening services. This versicle, apparently derived from Neh. ix. 5 (cf. Eccl. xlvi. 25, l. 22), was already in use in its expanded form c. A.D. 120, for it is cited in the Mishnah on the authority of R. Ishmael, who opposed the opinion of R. 'Akiba that the words should be simply 'Bless ye the Lord'.⁵ Probably the invocation was an established formula for calling the people to prayer, and the response of the congregation is a later addition to the service.⁶ The *Kaddish*, which now immediately precedes the invocation, was introduced into the liturgy to mark the end of one of the principal sections of the service (Singer, pp. 1-36), after that section had been incorporated in the public worship of the Synagogue.

The statutory daily Synagogue service originally consisted of two elements. These were (a) the *Shema'* with its blessings, and (b) the *Tefillāh*, or '*Amīdāh*'. The fact

¹ Certainly later than Maimonides (1135-1204), for it takes as its theme his Thirteen Principles of the Faith.

² Written in the Gaonic Age: authorship uncertain. ³ b.Ber. 6ob.

⁴ בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהוָה בָּרוּךְ הוּא (Singer, pp. 37 and 96). Cf. Blau, J.E., vol. vii, p. 137.

⁵ Ber. vii. 3.

⁶ So Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst* (3rd ed. Frankfurt 1931), p. 17.

that the original word for this second element was simply 'Prayer' shows that it was at least the main, if not the only prayer in the earliest stage of the liturgy. At the three daily services (*a*) and (*b*) together constituted Morning Service (*Shaharīth*) and Evening Service ('*Arbīth*). The Afternoon Service (*Minhāh*) consisted of (*b*) alone.

The custom of reading portions of the Pentateuch and the Prophets in the Synagogue on Sabbaths and holy days and at other stated times of the year is certainly pre-Christian. The origin of these lessons, especially the Prophetical lesson, is obscure. In the Jerusalem Talmud the tradition is given that Moses instituted the reading of the Law on the above occasions, since it says in Lev. xxiii. 44 that he 'declared unto the children of Israel the set feasts of the Lord'.¹ Here nothing is said as to the time of these lections. But the same source informs us that Ezra instituted the reading of the Law on Mondays and Thursdays and Sabbath afternoons.² It is evident that the introduction of a reading on Sabbath afternoons is later than the institution of a lesson from the Law at the Sabbath morning service. R. Meir and R. Judah ben Il'ai were still disputing in the second century A.D. as to whether or not the portions read on Sabbath afternoons should be repeated at the following Sabbath morning service,³ and a passage in Josephus suggests that the custom of breaking off the assembly at noon was still prevalent in

¹ j.Meg. iv. 1. 75a; *Maṣseketh Sopherim* x. 1 (ed. J. Müller, Leipzig 1878, p. xvii).

² Idem, Meg. iv. 1; cf. b.Baba Kamma 82a. Travers Herford suggests (*Talmud and Apocrypha*, London 1933, p. 57) that if the ordinance of b.B. K. 82a cannot be traced to Ezra, it can at least be attributed to the Sopherim who were his immediate successors. See Elbogen, op. cit., pp. 156 et seq., 538, and cf. the other tradition that the prophets and elders (men of the Great Assembly) were responsible for the institution, in b.B. K. 82a; *Mekilta* on Exod. xv. 22 (ed. Friedmann 45a, ed. Weiss 52b).

³ b.Meg. 31b; cf. Toṣ. Meg. iv. 10. According to the Mishnah (Meg. iii. 6) the regular lesson is read on Mondays, Thursdays, and Sabbath afternoons, but it is not taken in the count. See further, J. Rabbinowitz, *Mishnah Megillah* (Oxford 1931), p. 109.

A.D. 67.¹ It is probable that a Sabbath lesson from the Pentateuch goes back to 150 B.C.,² and the tradition that the Reading from the Law was instituted by Moses and reintroduced with additional ordinances by Ezra is not necessarily incompatible with this view, since there may well have been casual readings before a regular lectionary was evolved.

We know little about the origin of the Prophetical lesson (*Haftārāh*). It may either have been an independent item, or it may have been chosen to complement the Pentateuchal lesson (*Pārāshāh*).³ But it is evident that such a lesson formed part of the public worship on Sabbath in the time of Jesus.⁴

There may well have been, also, possibly on Sabbath afternoons, a cycle from the Hagiographa. This is suggested by the homilies in the *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* and the *Tanhuma*, which are both old Midrashim.⁵

It is fairly certain that the *Hallel*, consisting of psalms

¹ εἰ μὴ τὴν σύνοδον διέλυσεν ἐπελθοῦσα ἔκτη ὥρα, καθ' ἣν τοῖς αὐτίβασιν ἀριστοποιεῖσθαι νομίμων ἔστων ἡμῶν: Josephus, *Vita* liv. § 279 (ed. H. St. J. Thackeray in the Loeb series, London 1926, vol. i, p. 104).

² See Büchler in *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. v, pp. 420–68.

³ The older literature on the subject is listed in S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, 3rd series (Philadelphia 1934), p. 283, note 29. See also H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, Schweich Lectures 1920 (London 1921), pp. 45, 101 et seq.; Elbogen, op. cit., p. 156 et seq.

⁴ See Luke iv. 16 et seqq.

⁵ In his edition of the *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (Lyck 1868, Introd. pp. xxxviii–xl) Buber contended that this midrash is older than *Genesis Rabbah*, *Leviticus Rabbah*, and *Lamentations Rabbathi*; while Theodor (M.G.W.J. (1879), pp. 102–4) suggested that these latter midrashim are dependent upon it—a suggestion which was endorsed by H. Strack (*Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Eng. tr. Philadelphia 1931, p. 211). On the other hand, G. F. Moore (*Judaism*, vol. i, p. 169) considers that *Gen.R.* and *Lam.R.* are earlier than the *Pesikta*. Nevertheless there is, in any case, much old material contained in it. On the difficult question of the date of *Midrash Tanhuma* see Lauterbach, *J.E.*, vol. xii, p. 45 and L. Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter*, vol. i (1928), p. 32; also W. Bacher, *Agada der palästinischen Amoräer*, vol. iii (1899), pp. 512–14. Buber's final conclusion was that the *Tanhuma* is even older than the *Pesikta* (see his Introd. to his edition of *Midrash Tanhuma*, Vilna 1885). It was redacted in the fifth century, before the completion of the Babylonian Talmud (Lauterbach, loc. cit.).

of thanksgiving on certain festivals (Pss. cxiii–cxviii),¹ was an ancient element of the liturgy. In the Talmud a difference is noted between the usage of Palestine and that of Babylonia with regard to reciting the *Hallel*. In Palestine it is recited on eighteen days (in the year) and in Babylonia on twenty-one days.² The Palestinian source is given as 'R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak', who was R. Johanan's teacher and a Palestinian Amora of the first generation. If there was a difference of opinion and practice in his day, the custom of reciting *Hallel* is likely to be considerably older.

The Scriptures repeatedly prescribe confession of sin as a means to expiation and atonement. No definite formula of confession is given in the Bible, but in Yom. iii. 8 and iv. 2 the phrase 'I have committed iniquity and transgressed and sinned before thee', twice occurring in the traditional ritual of the Temple service for the Day of Atonement, seems to reflect an ancient formula which formed part of the High Priest's confession. This was taken over into the liturgy of the Synagogue for the Day of Atonement.

There are two traditional explanations of the custom of holding service thrice daily. The three services are said to originate with the three patriarchs.³ The second, and much more likely, explanation is that they are to correspond with the Temple offerings.⁴ Anything cited anonymously in the Talmud Babli is usually old, and it was perhaps thought in Talmudic times that the former explanation was current in the days of Ezra. Hence the inclusion of the tradition in the Talmud. But it would be difficult to maintain that the decision to have services in the Temple thrice daily was influenced by the traditional exegesis of Genesis, and not vice versa. The sacrificial system of Numbers ordains with great precision additional sacrifices (*Musafim*)

¹ These psalms are properly the 'Egyptian *Hallel*' as distinct from the Great *Hallel* (Ps. cxxxvi).

² b.'Arak. 10a; b.Ta'an. 28b.

³ b.Ber. 26b; j.Ber. iv. 1. 7b.

⁴ Idem.

for New Moons and holy days. When the Temple fell and the principle of making the Synagogue reminiscent of the Temple obtained, services were introduced to correspond with the *Müsāfiñ*. These 'additional' services consisted of the skeleton of the *Tefillāh* together with a reading of the appropriate sacrificial ordinance. That they existed before the fall of the Temple is quite possible in view of the institution of the *Ma'amad*, for we read in the Mishnah:

'How can a man's offering be offered while he does not stand by it? Therefore the First Prophets ordained twenty-four Courses, and for every Course there was a *Ma'amad* in Jerusalem made up of priests, levites, and Israelites. When the day was come for a Course to go up, the priests and the levites (as well as the lay representatives of the Israelites) of that Course went up to Jerusalem, while the bulk of the Israelites of that Course assembled in the synagogues of their respective towns, and read the chapter on the Creation.'¹

So part of them went up to the Temple as witnesses of the offering of the sacrifices, and part came together in their own town where they held prayers at fixed times during the day, coinciding with the fixed times of the sacrifices in the Temple. That these *Ma'amad* services were the origin of the Synagogue services has been held by many scholars,² and is, indeed, already implied in the Talmud.³

Having outlined briefly those parts of the liturgy of the Synagogue which can claim to have come down almost from its inception, it remains for us to deal at somewhat greater length with the *Shema'* and the *Tefillāh* which have always formed the two chief elements of daily morning and evening prayer.

2. *The Shema' and its Blessings*

The *Shema'* might almost be described as the Jewish Creed. There was nothing in Judaism comparable with

¹ Ta'an. iv. 2. Cf. the references to the *Ma'amad* in b.Ta'an. 15b; 27a, b.

² e.g. Elbogen, op. cit., pp. 237-9; H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford 1933), p. 794; &c.

³ חנו רבנן אונשי משמר מתפלליין על קרבן אחיהם שיתקבל ברצון ואונשי
מעמד נכסין לבית הכנסת וג'.
b.Ta'an. 27b.

the Christian creeds until the twelfth century of the Christian era when Maimonides composed his Thirteen Principles of the Faith.¹ But at least from the time when 'Akiba died a martyr's death with the *Shema'* upon his lips, it has been regarded as the *sine qua non* of Judaism. Thus a question of considerable importance for the study of early Christian worship arises. Is there any evidence that even before 'Akiba (died A.D. 135) the *Shema'* was the central element in the liturgy?

Resting on the authority of Dt. vi. 7 ('when thou liest down and when thou risest up'), the recitation of the *Shema'* every evening and morning is taken up as a matter of course in the Mishnah.² In this passage Rabban Gamaliel, one of the Tannaim of the second generation (c. A.D. 80–120) quotes the opinion of 'the sages' as to the limit of time up to which the evening *Shema'* may be recited. In another passage, which is paralleled in the *Tosefta*, we read of a discussion between the rival schools of Hillel and Shammai as to the posture which should be adopted in reciting the *Shema'*.³ Clearly the practice itself is already ancient. Josephus included it in 'the form of government which was agreeable to the dignity and virtue of Moses', when he urged: 'Let everyone commemorate before God the benefits bestowed upon them at their deliverance out of the land of Egypt,⁴ and this twice every day, both when the day begins and when the hour of sleep comes on.'⁵ In the Talmud the recitation of the *Shema'* is taken as, if not a Biblical ordinance, at least a fulfilment of a Biblical and not merely a Rabbinical injunction.⁶

¹ See Singer, p. 2. For indications of earlier attempts to formulate the dogmas of Judaism, in the works of R. Sa'adiah (A.D. 892–942) and others, see S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, first series (London 1896), pp. 197–8.

² Ber. i. 1–2.

³ Ber. i. 3; cf. *Toṣ. Ber.* i. 4 (ed. Zuckerman, p. 1). The Rabbis mentioned in both these passages belonged to the second generation of Tannaim (c. A.D. 90–130).

⁴ Probably a reference to the third section of the *Shema'* (Num. xv. 37–41). ⁵ *Ant.* iv. viii. 13. ⁶ b. *Men.* 99b.

In the ordinary course of events the *Shema'* was recited in Hebrew. But we know that in the Dispersion Greek was introduced into the Synagogue services as early as the third century before Christ, at any rate in Egypt, through the public reading of *Tōrāh* from the LXX version.¹ Acts (vi. 9) tells us that there were Hellenistic Jewish communities in Jerusalem, and we know from numerous Responsa of the Geonim that at a later date there were separate synagogues of Babylonians and Palestinians in many parts of Palestine.² We may suppose that these communities kept to their usual practice in the synagogues which they built for their own congregations resident in the Holy Land. At all events, the Palestinian Talmud tells us that 'R. Levi bar Haita went to Caesarea and heard that there they recite the *Shema'* in Greek'.³ There is no reason to suppose that this was an isolated instance, in view of the explicit statement in the Mishnah that the *Shema'*, along with certain other passages (including the *Tefillāh*), might be said in any language.⁴

But of what did the *Shema'* consist in the first century A.D.? Was it simply the declaration in Dt. vi. 4 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One Lord', or did it consist of all the three sections which we find in the modern prayer-books?⁵ Originally, it seems, the simple declaration of Dt. vi. 4 was used alone, for the recitation of the first verse of the *Shema'* is called 'the acceptance of the yoke of the kingship of God'.⁶ Maimonides says that it comes first 'because it contains the Unity of the Name, and His love and instruction, which is the great root upon which all (else) in it hangs'.⁷ This is, of course, pure homily, but according to the Talmudic rule, as soon as a child

¹ H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920), pp. 11, 12.

² Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs* (Oxford 1920), vol. i, pp. 148, 150, 167, 171.

³ j.Sot. vii. 1. 21b.

⁵ viz. Dt. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41 (Singer, pp. 40-2).

⁶ Ber. ii. 5.

⁴ Sot. vii. 1.

⁷ *Hilkoth Keriat Shema'* i. 2.

begins to speak, his father should teach him the verse Dt. xxxiii. 4 and the recitation of the *Shema'*. 'What does it mean by the *Shema'*?' asks the Baraita. '(It means) the first verse.'¹ Furthermore, a discussion of the law of *Kawwānāh*,² in its application to the recitation of the *Shema'*, occurs in the Talmud: and the conclusion cited in the name of R. Meir (*c.* A.D. 130–60) is as follows: 'Our Rabbis have taught, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One": up to here *Kawwānāh* is required. These are the words of R. Meir. Raba said: The *Halākāh* is in agreement with R. Meir.'³ The obvious inference to be drawn from this tradition is that the first sentence of the *Shema'* was the original, and therefore the most important part.

That the *Shema'* developed, in the first place, from the reading of the Law was maintained by Ludwig Blau more than forty years ago.⁴ The public reading of *Tōrāh* was effectively established by Ezra according to Neh. viii. 8, 18, and Blau saw in this the origin of a service capable of being performed *sans prêtres ni lévites*. The reading, which originally took place on the three festivals only (as is shown by the fact that the *Sifré*⁵ attributes the institution of the custom to Moses), was adopted later for the New Moons also, and then still later for the Sabbaths and two days of the week. After a further interval of time the need for a daily reading of the *Tōrāh* made itself felt. But a daily assembly would impose too heavy a burden on the people, who were mostly farmers with animals and crops to tend,⁶

¹ b.Suk. 42a.

² Lit. intention, attention; hence deliberate thought, concentration of one's mind upon one's religious devotions.

³ b.Ber. 13b.

⁴ 'Origine et histoire de la lecture du Schema', *R.E.J.*, vol. xxxi (1895), pp. 181–201.

⁵ *Sifré* i. 66 (ed. M. Friedmann 17a).

⁶ So at a later stage the *Pārāshāh* of Balak (Num. xxii. 2–xxiv. 5) was not included in the *Shema'* 'because of the trouble [its length would cause] to the congregation' (b.Ber. 12b, cf. j.Ber. i. 8. 3c).

and in order to get over this difficulty provision was made for an individual reading. When the Synagogue developed daily services, morning and evening, this primitive declaration of faith in the unity of God (followed by the response *Bārūkh Shēm*) was gradually expanded. The second paragraph of the *Shema'* (Dt. xi. 13-21) was added perhaps in the half-century before Antiochus Epiphanes; the third (Num. xv. 37-41) was probably added in the period of the Roman rule.¹

In the Mishnah the blessings accompanying the *Shema'*² are already taken for granted as much as the *Shema'* itself: 'In the morning two Benedictions are said before (it) and one after; and in the evening two Benedictions are said before and two after, the one long and the other short.'³ The first blessings at the morning and evening services dealt with Light and Darkness because they were said at sunrise and at sunset. The second blessing dealt with the mission of Israel, and was probably very much shorter in its original form than it is now; while the third blessing was a simple profession of faith in the Unity of God and the permanent validity of the Law. The final blessing, after the evening *Shema'*, is a natural and fitting conclusion to the work of the day that is past.

There has been much controversy about the date of these Benedictions. On the one hand, it has been maintained that already in the Temple the *Shema'* was preceded by the Benediction *Yōzēr 'Or* and followed by *Geullāh*, that the Decalogue was introduced into the Temple worship in the Greek period, and that it was preceded by *'Ahabāh* and followed by *'Emeth we-Yatzib*.⁴ On the other hand, a more recent scholar, who has had before him the fragments recovered from the Cairo Genizah which were not available to Blau,⁵ has suggested that although *Yōzēr 'Or*

¹ Blau, loc. cit.

² They may be found in Singer, pp. 37, 39, and 42; and pp. 96, 98, 99.

³ Ber. i. 4.

⁴ Blau, R.E.J., vol. xxxi, p. 196.

⁵ Published by Schechter, J.Q.R. (Old Series), vol. x, pp. 654-5, and

is to be traced to the Temple its original form was very much shorter than the form used in the Synagogue in the first century, while the other Benedictions were quite unknown before about A.D. 150 to 200.¹ If this latter theory appears at first sight somewhat revolutionary, it should be borne in mind that no scholar has as yet challenged it,² and that it does afford an explanation of the absence of any reference to these Benedictions in early Christian literature. If the Benedictions were not yet in common use when the Church separated from the Synagogue we should not expect to find an echo of them in the primitive services of the Church.

From these Genizah fragments we also find that the Decalogue was in use in the Palestinian synagogue at Fustat long after it had ceased to be used in Palestine itself.³ The story of its disappearance from the daily service 'because of the fault-finding of the heretics (*Minim*)', who said that only the Decalogue and not the *Shema'* was given to Moses at Sinai, is told in both the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.⁴ That the Decalogue was in use in the Temple, or the Synagogue, or both, during the first half of the first century is beyond question.⁵ It is equally certain that it was dropped out of the public worship in Palestine because of the *Minim* and that it continued in use in the

Jacob Mann, 'Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service' in *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati 1925), vol. ii, pp. 269-338.

¹ Finkelstein, 'La Kedouscha et les Bénédicitions du Schema' in *R.E.J.*, vol. xciii (1932), p. 26.

² Ginzberg's comments in *R.E.J.*, vol. xciii, p. 79 scarcely affect the validity of Finkelstein's argument.

³ Mann, op. cit., pp. 282-4, and 'Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecution' in *H.U.C.A.*, vol. iv, pp. 242-310, especially p. 288.

⁴ j.Ber. i. 8. 3c; b.Ber. 12a.

⁵ See Tamid v. 1. The latter part of this Mishnah, which refers to the benedictions mentioned above, has been shown to be an addition to the original text of the Mishnah, in an article by Ginzberg in the *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, vol. i, p. 33 et seq. I have not had access to this journal, but its findings have been accepted by Blau (*R.E.J.*, vol. xxxii, p. 182) and Finkelstein (*J.Q.R.* (New Series), vol. xvi, p. 39 note 86).

Palestinian ritual in Egypt. The Nash Papyrus corroborates the evidence of its use amongst the Jews in the Diaspora,¹ and Pliny is witness that the early Christians continued to recite the Decalogue in their own assemblies.²

3. *The Daily Blessings*

The Genizah fragments have proved equally valuable in assessing the date of those Benedictions which form the second important section of the daily service of the Synagogue, and which are called in the oldest sources simply *Tefillāh*. The name *Shemōneh 'Esrēh* by which they are commonly known among Christian scholars means 'Eighteen', and its wide use in the Rabbinic literature shows that *at the time it came into vogue* the number of Benedictions included in the prayer must have been eighteen. But originally there were fewer than eighteen, and they were not all added at the same time. The first three and the last three Benedictions are universally recognized as the oldest.³ They probably represent the prayers at the close of the old *Ma'amad* service.⁴ The individual worshippers offered their private petitions to God just as they felt inclined. After they had made their supplications the Reader would sum up all their prayers. His prayer was fixed, and it was always a request that their supplications might be accepted. But the Reader's prayer was not written; it must, therefore, have been memorized and handed down from one generation to the next in the customary oriental fashion.⁵ Thus it is probable that the

¹ For literature concerning the papyrus see S. A. Cook in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, vol. xxv (1903), p. 34 et seq.; F. C. Burkitt, *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. xv (1903), p. 392 et seq., vol. xvi, p. 559; Mann, op. cit., vol. ii, p. 283; Loewe, *Judaism and Christianity*, vol. i (London 1937), p. 141.

² *Epist.* x. xcvi (*ad Traj.*). See further on this subject p. 104 below.

³ The suggestion was first made by Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, ed. 2, p. 380.

⁴ Blau, art. 'Liturgy', in *J.E.*, vol. viii, p. 137.

⁵ Cf. the office of *Rāwī*, or memorizer and reciter of verses, among the Arabs.

later fixed forms arose out of the use of traditional phrases by successive leaders in prayer, so that what was originally *extempore* prayer became more and more stereotyped as the years passed.¹

The Talmud states that the 'Men of the Great Synagogue' instituted certain Benedictions and prayers,² and, further, that the 'Eighteen Benedictions' were 'arranged' by Simeon ha-Pakoli³ in the time of Gamaliel II (c. A.D. 80–120).

Modern criticism has thrown doubt upon these traditions and has questioned the existence of such a body as the 'Men of the Great Synagogue'.⁴ But even earlier Israel Lévi had rightly pointed out⁵ that if the '*Amidāh*' was already a long-established institution in the days of R. Joshua and R. 'Akiba then it is very remarkable that there is no veneration for the Temple, for the priests, or the sacrificial cult in any of the Benedictions except the seventeenth (*תשע*). Had there ever been such references the

¹ This process can be seen also in the development of the Christian liturgy if the prayer in *Clement* lix–lxii be compared with the fixed liturgical prayers of later times.

² b.Ber. 33a.

³ b.Meg. 17b. The term *Shemōneh 'Esrēh* was in common use by the time the Talmud was redacted. It does not follow that Simeon ha-Pakoli defined the *Tefillāh* as consisting of eighteen Benedictions; still less that he used the phrase *Shemōneh 'Esrēh* himself.

⁴ See Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volk.* (Eng. tr. 1901), ii. 1, pp. 354 et seq. and Kohler, 'The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions' in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati 1924), vol. i, pp. 387–425, and works cited in the following pages. In the writer's view Kohler was somewhat unjust in his treatment of Elbogen on the above traditions. 'Too many of his theories', says Kohler (*op. cit.*, p. 387), 'are arbitrary assumptions. . . . He starts, in fact (*Der jüd. Gottesdienst in seiner gesch. Entwicklung*, p. 28) with the fundamental error of confounding the "arrangement" (*hisdir*) of the Eighteen Benedictions . . . with their "institution" (*thiknu*).'
Elbogen did nothing of the kind. What he did say was that the Talmud harmonized the two traditions: 'Der Talmud sucht die beiden Angaben auszugeleichen, durch die Annahme, daß das Gebet inzwischen vergessen und dann wieder neu geschaffen wurde (Meg. das). Dieser Ausweg ist ungängbar, mit dem Verlauf des Volkslebens nicht vereinbar; es ist ein Harmonisierungsversuch, der allem widerspricht, was die Vernunft zuläßt und die Geschichte berichtet.'

⁵ R.E.J., vol. xxxii (1896), p. 162.

Rabbis after A.D. 70 would never have deleted them, not only because of the weight of public opinion which would have been against them but because of their own respect for the Sanctuary. Lévi was in error, however, in thinking the most recent parts of the '*Amidāh*' were composed by the Pharisaic supporters of the Synagogue well before the destruction of the Temple, while the Hasmoneans still ruled over Judaea.¹

Further investigation, aided by the discovery of the Genizah fragments already mentioned,² has shown that some of the Benedictions at least date from the period subsequent to the fall of the Temple.³ It is not necessary to trace out Finkelstein's arguments in detail here. Briefly, he took it as his first axiom that the oldest paragraphs of the '*Amidāh*' are those which contain the term '*Adhonai 'Elohēnū*'; and secondly, those containing the term '*Ābinū* 'our Father', represent a transitional stage. Yet another criterion for the fixing of the approximate dates of the Benedictions is the use of a seven-word formula. Prayers for the coming of the Kingdom of God have always been most fervently offered during times of persecution and political upheaval. The bitter feeling against the Kingdoms of the World which developed and became intensified in the years immediately prior to the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 turned men's thoughts once more to the Kingship of God and the hope of the world to come. So again in connexion with the movement of the Bar Cochba rebellion, apocalyptic and eschatological ideas seized hold on men's minds. It was in this atmosphere of a changing outlook and of expectation for the future

¹ *R.E.J.*, vol. xxxii (1896), p. 167. Cf. Isidore Loeb, *ibid.*, vol. xix, p. 22 et seq.

² Edited by Schechter, *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. x, pp. 654-9; Lévi, *R.E.J.*, vol. liii, pp. 231-41; Elbogen, *M.G.W.J.*, vol. lv, pp. 426-46, 586-99; Mann, *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati), vol. ii, pp. 269-338.

³ Finkelstein, 'The Development of the 'Amidah' in the *J.Q.R.* (New Series), vol. xvi, pp. 1-43, 127-70.

that the daily blessings of the '*Amidāh*' were extended to something like their present form.

If the table at the end of this book be examined,¹ it will be evident that the '*Amidāh*' recited by Jesus at Nazareth may not have contained all the paragraphs which Paul recited later in the synagogues of the Diaspora. The liturgy was growing all the time. Hence we shall not expect to find a complete parallel in Christian worship to the 'Eighteen Benedictions' of the later Synagogue.

¹ The translation of the Palestinian version has been made by the present writer from the text published by Schechter. *Vide infra*, pp. 114-25.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIAN WEEK

1. *The Lord's Day*

IN the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul we find the first day of the week was already regarded among Christians as a day of special importance. On that day they met together for instruction and worship, when the 'breaking of bread' formed part of the service.¹ The evidence of the Apocryphal Acts is similar. A sermon preached by John 'on the Lord's Day' is followed by the Eucharist.² After the raising of Nicostratus

'the mother of the lad besought Peter to set foot in her house. But Peter had appointed to be with Marcellus on the Lord's day to see the widows even as Marcellus had promised, to minister unto them with his own hands.'³

The testimony of these Apocryphal writings may not carry such weight as the evidence of the New Testament or the Apostolic Fathers, but it is of considerable importance as a secondary source. A later document than either of those quoted above fixes 'the Lord's Day' as the day on which occurred the Annunciation, the birth of Jesus, the Triumphal entry, and the Resurrection; furthermore, on 'the Lord's Day' Christ will come to judge the quick and the dead, and the assumption of the Virgin will take place.⁴ This is, of course, simply Christian *Haggadah*, comparable to the Rabbinic statements that 'on the eve of the first Sabbath the Creation took place',⁵ and 'on Friday, on the sixth of the month, at the sixth hour of the day, Israel received the commandments'.⁶ But just as the Jewish Midrash was designed to emphasize the importance

¹ Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

² *Acts of John*, cvi (ed. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 266). Not later than c. A.D. 150.

³ *Acts of Peter*, xxix (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 329).

⁴ *Assumption of the Virgin* (Greek Narrative), xxxvii, xxxviii (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 206).

⁵ *Pirkē de-R. Eliezer* (trans. Friedlander, p. 124 et seq.).

⁶ *Ibid.* (Friedlander, p. 359).

of the Sabbath, so the Christian Midrash laid emphasis on the pre-eminence of 'the Lord's Day'. The matter was summed up by Ignatius, in his typically anti-Jewish style, in these words:

'If then those who had walked in ancient practices attained unto newness of hope, no longer observing sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's day, on which our life also arose through Him and through His death which some deny . . . if this be so, how shall we be able to live apart from Him?'

The Lord's Day, then, very early achieved a position among Christians equal to that of the Sabbath among the Jews. The *stato die* of Pliny's letter to Trajan might equally refer to Saturday, or Sunday, but in view of the peculiar emphasis which Christians laid on 'the Lord's Day' it is probable that he was referring to Sunday. The date of the *Didache* is still doubtful, but it probably describes the type of worship common in the first century. From this document it is clear that Sunday was the normal day for the celebration of the Eucharist.² Lastly, the well-known passage in Justin Martyr vouches for the existence of regular Christian assemblies on the Lord's Day in the first half of the second century. The passage, though well known, is so important as to justify being quoted in full.

'On the day of the Sun all who live in towns or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. Then when the reader has finished, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of the good examples cited. Then all rise together and prayers are offered. At length, as we have already described, prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayer and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent by saying, Amen: and the distribution is made to each one of his share of the elements which have been blessed, and to those who are not present it is sent by the ministry of the deacons.'³

¹ *Ad Magnes.* ix. 1 (ed. Lightfoot, op. cit., Part II, vol. ii, p. 128).

² xiv. 1. For the Greek text see *The Teaching of the Apostles*, ed. J. Rendel Harris (London 1887), p. 9.

³ Justin, *Apol.* i. lxvii; P.G. vi. 429.

Evidently the Eucharist was regularly celebrated on the Lord's Day at this date, and it was preceded by a service corresponding to the later Pro-Anaphora. To this we must return at a later stage of our discussion.

2. *The Sabbath*

Although the Lord's Day seems to have been the chief festival of the Christian week from the very beginning of the Church, there must have been many Christians who doubted whether it was right to give up the custom of keeping holy the Sabbath Day. They wanted to pay homage to their Lord on the day on which He rose from the dead, namely, the first day of the week. But the Old Testament was their Holy Scripture, no less than the Bible of the Jews, and in it was the divine command to keep holy the seventh (Sabbath) day. Moreover, the force of custom is great, and we can scarcely doubt that in the earliest days of the Church the Christians were not only 'daily in the Temple' but also kept the Sabbath with their brethren.

It is true that the obligation to observe the Sabbath according to the minute prescriptions of the Rabbis was never binding on Christians. Jesus had challenged legalism at this very point, but he never attacked the institution of the Sabbath itself. Paul followed his Master's lead, as appears from several of his letters.¹ But it is going too far to suggest that the Church substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath,² that 'the Sabbath properly so called, the sabbath of the Jews, with everything connected with it as a positive ordinance, was swept away by Christianity'.³ It is historically untrue to say of the early Church that 'the Sunday is not substituted for the Jewish sabbath; the sabbath is

¹ Col. ii. 16, 17; Gal. iv. 10.

² Duchesne, *Christian Worship* (Eng. tr. 1923), p. 228.

³ J. A. Hessey (Bampton Lect. for 1860, Lect. V *ad init.*) quoted by S. R. Driver in *H.D.B.*, s.v. 'Sabbath'.

abolished; and the observance of the First Day of the week is an analogous institution'.¹ The Sabbath did not disappear from the actual practice of the Christian Church.²

Individual Christians, no doubt, pressed the teaching of Paul to its logical conclusion. If the ritual enactments of the Law were but 'a shadow of the things to come' (Col. ii. 17), if Paul was right in saying 'Was any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Hath any been called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised' (1 Cor. vii. 18), then it could be argued that those born in the Jewish faith were at liberty to continue Sabbath observance, while Gentile converts were not under any obligation to do the same. Ignatius urged that the adherents of the New Faith should be 'no longer keeping the Sabbath, but living in the spirit of the Lord's Day',³ and Justin Martyr maintained that circumcision, the Sabbaths, and all the festivals, were enjoined on account of the transgressions and hardness of heart of the Jews.⁴ But these two writers seem to represent the extreme of antinomianism. The command to keep holy the Sabbath day was enshrined in the Decalogue, and it was the Decalogue, alone of the Mosaic laws, which the Jewish Christians held to be still valid.⁵ For that very reason it was dropped from the daily service of the Synagogue.⁶ *Barnabas* dismissed the food laws and the law of circumcision as never having been intended to be kept literally. They were to be kept spiritually.⁷ But he drew a further distinction. There were two Laws. The Decalogue, written on tables of stone, was not given to the Jews for the tables were broken, 'but the

¹ S. R. Driver, op. cit., vol. iv, p. 322b.

² See the very much fairer statement of the case which appears as a well-documented article in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, s.v. 'Sabbath'.

³ Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* ix. 1; ed. Lightfoot (loc. cit.): μήκετι σαββατίζοντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες. The text of P.G. v. 767-8 is very corrupt.

⁴ *Dialog. c. Tryph.* xviii; P.G. vi. 516.

⁵ j.Ber. i. 8. 3c (middle); cf. b.Ber. 12a.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Cf. St. Paul's attitude in Rom. vii. 14.

Lord himself gave it to us'.¹ Irenaeus held that the natural precepts are all common to Christians and to the Jews, though by the former more fully developed.² These precepts are written in the Decalogue. But because of the worship of the calf God instituted a second Law, to which Moses added some precepts 'on account of their hardness of heart'.³ Thus, although the ceremonial laws of the Mosaic code were abrogated, the Decalogue was held in great esteem by Christians in the first and second centuries, as the emphasis laid upon its precepts in the *Didache* shows. It is scarcely likely that the Fourth Commandment was alone discarded.

Granted, then, that individual Christians urged the casting off of everything even remotely connected with the Jewish Law, they probably do not represent the consensus of opinion in the Church. There were others who compromised by observing both Saturday and Sunday as holy days. This appears from a passage in Irenaeus, who quotes verses from Ezekiel (xx. 12) and Exodus (xxi. 13).⁴ These verses of Scripture were still being used in the early fourth century as the basis of Christian *Haggādāh* on the duty of resting on both the Sabbaths.⁵

About the time of Irenaeus the Sabbath was apparently looked upon in Asia Minor as an integral part of the week,

¹ *Barnabas* xiv. 1-5; this passage and the next following are cited by R. H. Snape in *A Rabbinic Anthology*, ed. Montefiore and Loewe (London 1938), p. 629.

² *Adv. Haer.* iv. xiii. 4; P.G. vii. 1009.

³ *Ibid.* iv. xv. 1, 2; P.G. vii. 1012.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. xvi. 1; P.G. vii. 1015.

⁵ *Statutes of the Apostles*, ed. Horner (London 1904), Statute 66 (Ethiopic version). This statute does not belong to the Egyptian Church Order, according to Connolly, *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents (Cambridge Texts and Studies, VIII. iv)*, Cambridge 1916, p. 4. It is part of 'that curious little work known variously as the "Ecclesiastical Canons" and the "Apostolic Church Order"' (Connolly, op. cit., p. 3). In a letter to the present writer Dom Connolly has expressed the opinion that this document is 'more probably of the early fourth century than of the third'. See further his article in *J.T.S.*, vol. xxiv (Jan. 1923), pp. 155-6, and his edition of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Oxford 1929), pp. lxxxiv-lxxxv.

by which one could date events, equally with the Lord's Day.¹ We have no knowledge of the way in which the Sabbath was kept at this date in the land of the later Cappadocian Fathers. But the general practice of the East seems to have been to regard Saturday as a day of festival rejoicings, always excepting the Great Sabbath, the Saturday of Holy Week, which was, and still is, observed as a fast. This is illustrated by Origen's Haggadic description of the Christian observance of the Sabbath:

'As the second festival, then, after the festival of the daily (*lit.* incessant) sacrifice,² is put the sacrifice of the Sabbath; and every holy and just man must keep also the festival of the Sabbath. Yet what is the festival of the Sabbath but that of which the Apostle speaks: "There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest", that is the observance of the Sabbath, for the people of God (Heb. iv. 9)? Leaving on one side, therefore, the Jewish observances of the Sabbath, let us see of what kind the observance of the Sabbath ought to be for the Christian. On the Sabbath no worldly affairs ought to be undertaken. If, therefore, you abstain from all secular works, and do nothing worldly, but employ yourself in spiritual works, and come to church and give ear to the Scripture lections and to sermons, if you think on heavenly things and are concerned for (your) future hope, if you have before your eyes the coming judgement, and do not look to the present and visible, but to the invisible and future, this is the observance of the Sabbath for the Christian.'³

There is no direct reference here to the literal observance of the day among Christians, but Origen's picture of the Sabbath is strangely reminiscent of the best Rabbinic teaching on the subject. Attendance at the Synagogue on Sabbath for the hearing of Scripture lections and sermons, as well as prayer and praise, was incumbent on all Jews. In the thought of the Rabbis, the Sabbath is of the essence

¹ *Acts of Peter* xv, xvi (in *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 317); cf. xviii (ibid., p. 320). The Sabbath is mentioned again in chap. xxxi (ibid., p. 330) and the Lord's Day in chap. xxx (ibid.). M. R. James (*op. cit.*, p. 300) regards the document as having been written in Greek by a resident in Asia Minor not later than A.D. 200.

² This does not necessarily refer to a daily Eucharist. See further on pp. 48-9.

³ Origen, *Hom. in Num.* xxiii. 4; P.G. xii. 749.

of the world to come;¹ or, to express the relationship in another way, the world to come is a day that is all Sabbath.²

Among the Christians both Sabbath and Lord's Day were regarded as feasts, 'for the one is the memorial of the Creation, the other of the Resurrection'.³ There is still extant an elaborate and beautiful prayer which emphasizes the sacred character of the Sabbath:

'O Almighty Lord, who didst create the world through Christ, and didst ordain the Sabbath as a memorial of creation, because in it Thou didst rest from Thy work. . . . Thou, O Lord, didst bring our fathers out of Egypt. . . . Thou didst command them to keep the Sabbath, not giving in this an excuse for idleness but an occasion for godliness.'⁴

The prohibition of work on the Lord's Day extended to the Sabbath,⁵ and both days were observed as festal days even during the fast of Lent.⁶ Whatever authority these documents may have had, they clearly represent a very considerable body of Christian opinion and practice in the East during the third and fourth centuries. It is, indeed, probable that they reflect the tradition of the Church from the beginning, for even in the West there was no fasting on Saturdays before the third century. No document of the first or second centuries mentions fasting on the Sabbath. If it had been customary, we should expect the *Didache*, at least, to make mention of the Sabbath along with the fourth day and the Preparation (Friday).⁷ The fact that it does not is quite in keeping with what we know

¹ b.Ber. 57b.

² *Aboth de-R. Nathan* i. 8, fol. 3a (foot), ed. S. Schechter (London 1887).

³ *Const. Apost.* VII. xxiii. 2, ed. P. A. de Lagarde (Leipzig 1862), p. 207: τὸ μὲν δημιουργίας ἑστίν ὑπόμνημα, τὸ δὲ ἀναστάσεως.

⁴ *Ibid.* VII. xxxvi. 1, 2; ed. Lagarde, p. 219.

⁵ *Ibid.* VIII. xxxii. 1; ed. Lagarde, p. 269.

⁶ Council of Laodicea, Canons 49, 51; *vide* Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles* (ed. 2, Paris 1907-), tom. i. 2, pp. 1021-2. Saturdays and Sundays in Lent were not to be observed as fasts, according to Athanasius, *Epist. Heortastic.* vi. 13; P.G. xxvi. 1389. Cf. Council in Trullo, Canon 55.

⁷ viii. 1; ed. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (London 1891), p. 221.

of the Catholic point of view from another source.¹ Even the heretical Montanists did not keep Saturdays and Sundays as part of their *Xerophagiae*, or dry meals.² At Rome there were evidently some who favoured the idea of prolonging the Friday fast occasionally to the Saturday. This was condemned by Hippolytus³ and by Tertullian,⁴ but became the general practice there from the end of the third century onwards.⁵ Elsewhere some churches fasted on the Sabbath while others kept it as a feast even in the time of Augustine.⁶

The importance of the two Sabbaths in the Christian week, and their festal nature, were marked by celebrations of the Eucharist every Saturday and Sunday at an early date. How early the custom of a Saturday Eucharist may be it is impossible to say from the documents we possess. It may have come into vogue very early. The recently discovered *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus was written at Rome either in the Pontificate of Zephyrinus or in that of Callistus: it may be dated within a year or two of A.D. 215, in any case.⁷ Now the Ethiopic version of the *Egyptian Church Order*, which is nothing else than this *Apostolic Tradition*,⁸ commands the bishop to celebrate the Eucharist with the assistance of the deacons 'on the sabbath and on the first day of the week, if it be possible'.⁹ Dix regards

¹ Hippolytus, *Com. in Dan.* iv. 20; ed. Bonwetsch and Achelis, vol. iii., p. 236, in the Berlin series: καὶ γὰρ νῦν τινες τὰ δύοια τὸλμῶσι προσέχοντες ὅρμασι ματαίοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαμωνται (1 Tim. iv. 1) καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ πολλάκις νηστεῖαν ὅριζονται, ἥπερ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἄριστον.

² Tertullian, *De Jejun.* xv.; P.L. ii. 1025.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ *De Jejun.* xiv.; P.L. ii. 973; *Adv. Marc.* iv. xii.; P.L. ii. 413 (foot)-414.

⁵ Victorinus, *De Fabr. Mund. Fragment*; P.L. v. 304, 306; Augustine, *Ep. (ad Cassulanum)* xxxvi. 2; P.L. xxxiii. 136.

⁶ Loc. cit. At Milan the day was not kept as a fast: Aug., *Ep. (ad Januarium)* liv. 3; P.L. xxxiii. 200.

⁷ G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of S. Hippolytus of Rome*, vol. i (London 1937), p. xxxvii.

⁸ So R. H. Connolly (op. cit.), who reached this conclusion independently of its earlier attribution to Hippolytus by E. Schwartz in *Über die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (Schriften der wissenschaft. Gesellschaft in Strassburg, vi), 1910.

⁹ *Ap. Trad.* xxiv. 1 (ed. Dix, p. 43); Horner, op. cit., p. 157. The whole

the words 'on the Sabbath' as an interpolation in E. (= Ethiopic version), although they are present in *all* manuscripts of E., on the ground that they are not in K. (= Canons of Hippolytus) and that 'Saturday was not a liturgical day at Rome in the third century'.¹ But K. is a drastic re-casting of the *Apostolic Tradition*, which it has used with great freedom, altering the whole bearing of much in its original and shuffling the order of some of its parts.² Dix himself assigns it to the fifth or the sixth century.³ By this time the old Sabbath Eucharist had practically disappeared in the East: hence the absence of all reference to it in K. On the other hand, E. contains the more ancient textual tradition of the *Egyptian Church Order*, the document which Connolly proved to be the direct source of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Testament*, and K.⁴ The *Testament*, which probably originated in Syria or Asia Minor about A.D. 350, enjoins that 'the Offering only be on Saturday, and on the first day of the week, and on a fast day'.⁵ On Saturday the bishop is to offer three loaves as a symbol of the Trinity and on the first day of the week four loaves for a symbol of the Gospel.⁶ It is, therefore, gratuitous to regard the passage in E. as an interpolation. We have the evidence of Origen for the early third-century observance of the Sabbath in Egypt. The *Apostolic Tradition*, representing the universal primitive rite of Christendom as it remained at the end of the second century—a rite that is Jewish through and through, Jewish in form and feeling, saturated in Paschal conceptions, transcended and Christianized, but recognizably Jewish all the same⁷—shows us the place which the Sabbath held at Rome in the weekly services of

of chap. xxiv is wrongly rejected by B. S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, Eng. tr. (Cambridge 1934); cf. Dix, op. cit., p. 82.

¹ Op. cit., p. 43n.

² Dix, op. cit., p. lxxvii.

³ Ibid., p. xlvi.

⁴ Connolly, op. cit., p. 147 *et passim*.

⁵ i. 22. See the note in J. Cooper and A. J. Maclean, *The Testament of Our Lord* (Edinburgh 1902), p. 163.

⁶ Test. i. 23.

⁷ Dix, op. cit., p. xli.

the Christian. And the Eucharist, of course, was preceded by the Pro-Anaphora on Saturdays, as well as on Sundays.

The *Sacramentary of Sarapion* is said to be a collection of prayers representing the usage of Egypt and the Delta in the middle of the fourth century.¹ Among these prayers is one which bears the title *εὐχὴ πρώτη κυριακῆς*. This is hardly conclusive evidence that Sarapion only provides for a Sunday Eucharist, as Cooper and Maclean have already pointed out.² In any case, Brightman was certainly wrong when he spoke of 'the rise of the observance of the Sabbath, which was coming into use in the East by c. 375'.³ The mere fact that references to a Saturday Eucharist become fairly common at about this date is no good reason for making such a sweeping assertion. Whether there was a Saturday Eucharist or not, there was certainly Sabbath observance, which included public worship in Origen's time at Alexandria. In other Churches a Saturday Eucharist was celebrated a century and a half earlier than Brightman allowed.

Indeed, it is possible that a decline in Sabbath worship was setting in about the middle of the fourth century. Epiphanius speaks of synaxes being held in *some* places on the Sabbath, as if the custom were no longer universal.⁴ In Alexandria, for instance, the Eucharist was not celebrated on Saturday at the close of the fourth century, though other parts of Egypt followed the general practice of the East.⁵ Rome is said to have agreed with Alexandria in this respect.⁶ We are forced to the conclusion, then, either that the Saturday Eucharist was common in Rome at the time of Hippolytus and was already in disuse when

¹ Brightman, in *J.T.S.*, vol. i (1899), p. 91.

² Op. cit., p. 164. Origen, however, does not mention a Saturday Eucharist (*vide supra*, p. 31).

³ *J.T.S.*, vol. i, p. 92. Brightman substantiated his remark simply by stating that the Sabbath 'was already established in Egypt under Timothy of Alexandria, c. 380', and giving references to prove that fact.

⁴ *Expos. Fid.* xxiv; P.G. xlvi. 832.

⁵ Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. xix; P.G. lxvii. 1477.

⁶ Ibid.

Sozomen wrote, or that Sozomen was somewhat ill-informed about conditions in the West.

Whether the Eucharist was everywhere celebrated on the Sabbath or not, there were assemblies for worship on both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day.¹ The two days were still regarded with almost equal veneration in the fourth century in Asia Minor:

'If you have despised the Sabbath, with what face (*lit. eyes*) will you behold the Lord's Day? . . . They are sisters.'²

A curiously modern note was sounded by one preacher, who complained of those who could not find time to give up a part of both days, or even of the Lord's Day, to attendance at church.³ Evidently both days were still the occasion of special acts of worship; and although in the West Sunday had become the chief day for religious instruction and worship in Augustine's time, he insisted that the Sabbath should be spiritually kept. He says:

"Observe the Sabbath day": this commandment concerns us still more than it concerns them. The Jews observe the Sabbath in a servile way (*serviliter*), spending it in rioting and drunkenness. How much better could their women be employed at the spinning wheel, than in dancing on that day in the balconies of their houses (*maenianis*). Let us not say for a moment, my brethren, that they observe the Sabbath. The Christian observes the Sabbath spiritually, abstaining from servile work. For what is "from servile work"? From sin. How do we prove this? Ask the Lord: "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (Jn. viii. 34). So that on us likewise is enjoined spiritually the observance of the Sabbath."⁴

Similar taunts were aimed at the Jews, in connexion with their alleged excesses on the Sabbath, by many of the Patristic writers. It is all the more interesting to note their repeated emphasis on the 'true' observance of the Sabbath

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. viii; P.G. lxvii. 689: φημὶ δὴ τὸ τε Σάββατον καὶ ἡ Κυριακὴ ἐν αἷς αἱ συνάξεις κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰώθασι γίνεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

² Gregory of Nyssa, *De Castig.* ii; P.G. xlvi. 309.

³ Chrysostom, *In Matth. Hom.* v. 1; P.G. lvii. 55.

⁴ *In Joannis Evang. Tract.* iii. 19; P.L. xxxv. 1404.

among Christians. Moreover, the Jewish influence on their thinking and upon their worship was stronger than they knew. The passage from Augustine quoted above is an almost perfect example of Rabbinic homily, such as might be found on any page of the *Talmud* or the *Midrashim*. Moreover, the festal character of the Sabbath, with its Eucharist, persisted in most places both in the East and in the West long after Augustine had passed away.

To suggest that the holding of services on Saturdays was a fourth-century innovation¹ is to neglect much of the evidence of the early Christian writers and to ignore the fact that the Church grew out of the Synagogue. Nor is it likely that an attempt would have been made to introduce such services at a time when antagonism to Jewish customs was on the increase. The whole tendency of that age was to ridicule everything savouring of Judaism.² The fact, therefore, that Christians continued to hold services on the old Jewish Sabbath affords a strong presumption of the high antiquity of these among them.

3. *Station Days*

In Judaism Monday and Thursday were the days appointed for public fasting if the autumn rains had not commenced by the seventeenth of the month Marheshvan.³ There is no evidence that these days of the week were kept as public fasts throughout the year. Nevertheless, there were many who regularly kept them as private fasts. We read that the disciples of John the Baptist did not understand why the disciples of Jesus did not fast as they and the Pharisees did, apparently at set times.⁴ Among the Pharisees Monday and Thursday were kept as fast-days.⁵

There does not appear to have been any corresponding

¹ Duchesne, op. cit., p. 231.

² Cf. Jerome, *In Isaiam* lviii; P.L. xxiv. 582: *Ep. cxxi*; P.L. xxii. 1006: and see Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (London 1934), chap. v, esp. pp. 153–7. ³ Ta'an. i. 3 and ii. 9; cf. b.Ta'an. 16a.

⁴ Mk. ii. 18; Mt. ix. 14; Lk. v. 33.

⁵ Cf. Lk. xviii. 12.

custom among the Christians of the first century in the West. At all events, there is no reference to fasting in Clement, Justin, or Irenaeus. The *Apostolic Tradition*, which 'claims explicitly to be recording only the forms and models of rites *already* traditional and customs *already* long established, and to be written in deliberate protest against innovations',¹ simply sets down the old Roman rule of voluntary fasting for presbyters and laity. Fasting should be frequent, but 'when they wish'.² Tertullian also testifies that it stood thus in his day among the Catholics.³ Not until the advent of Montanism was there any change in the West.

In the East the Jewish influence was stronger, and it was reinforced continually by converts from Judaism. Evidently many continued to observe the Monday and Thursday fasts. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the need of such a strict injunction as the *Didache* provided at the close of the second century: 'Let not your fasts coincide with those of the hypocrites for they fast on the second [Monday] and fifth days of the week [Thursday]; but fast ye on the fourth day [Wednesday] and on the preparation day [Friday].'⁴

¹ Dix, op. cit., p. xi.

² *Ap. Trad.* xxv.1 (ed. Dix, p. 44).

³ *De Jejun.* ii; P.L. ii. 1007 (top).

⁴ viii. 1; ed. Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers* (1891), p. 221. The date of the *Didache* is still disputed. Robinson, Connolly, Muilenburg, and Vokes have demonstrated beyond any reasonable question the direct dependence of the *Didache* on Christian documents of the first half of the second century. Dix (op. cit., p. xlvi) suggests that a date c. A.D. 190 would best suit all the circumstances. Vokes (*The Riddle of the Didache*, London 1938, pp. 86, 87) places it between A.D. 167 and 233. His theory that it was 'an artificial literary composition composed of apostolic material in apostolic language to teach men what the Montanist Church thought' (op. cit., p. 219) will not meet with universal approval: nor is he convincing in his dismissal of the Jewish strain in the book which was noted by C. Taylor and R. D. Middleton (*ibid.*, pp. 123-5). But undoubtedly the Montanists of Asia Minor and Syria were responsible for introducing into the West the Wednesday and Friday fasts. Attempts to defend the theory of an early date for the *Didache*, which would place it before the middle of the second century at the latest, will be found in articles by B. H. Streeter (*J.T.S.*, October 1936) and J. M. Creed (*ibid.*, October 1938).

The separation from the Jews thus signalized was not forgotten in the third century. The 'custom of the former people' was to be eschewed, while Wednesdays and Fridays were marked as fast-days throughout the year 'because on the fourth day of the week they began to destroy their souls' by apprehending Christ, and Friday was the day on which they crucified Him.¹

Another reason for fasting, among the Christians, was to supply the poor and needy with necessary food out of the expenditure which would have been incurred had there been no fast.² It is interesting to find fasting recommended in order to be able to give food to the needy,³ for among the Jews also there was a saying that 'the reward of the fast-day is in the amount of charity distributed'.⁴ The giving of charity on a fast-day, especially the distribution of food necessary for the evening meal, was much encouraged.⁵ There seems, then, to be some kind of connexion between the Jewish and Christian customs of fasting on two days in the week.

Now Monday and Thursday were the old market days in Palestine, when alone the country folk would congregate in the villages. The custom of reading lessons from the Scriptures on these days in the synagogues was certainly a pre-Christian institution.⁶ The fact that the Synagogue service on these fast-days was more elaborate than on the other weekdays would not in itself give us ground for assuming that the Christians also marked their fast-days with any special form of worship. But it is evident that in practice they did. Hermas speaks of fasts, about A.D. 140, and gives them for the first time the title of 'stations' (*στατιών*), without indicating the days on which they were

¹ *Didascalia Apostolorum*, xxi; ed. R. H. Connolly (Oxford 1929), p. 184.

² Hermas, *Simil.* v. 3; P.G. ii. 960.

³ It is repeated in Aristides, *Apolog.* xv; ed. J. Rendel Harris in *Texts and Studies*, vol. i (Cambridge 1893), p. 49. Almsgiving at the time of the twice-weekly fasts is specifically mentioned in *Const. Apost.* v. xx; ed. Lagarde, p. 155.

⁴ b.Ber. 6b.

⁵ b.Sanh. 35a.

⁶ *Vide supra*, p. 13.

held.¹ Tertullian also mentions these stations which, he says, some censure on the score of novelty, others because of their being prolonged too late habitually; and he states that they occurred on Wednesday and Friday.² The custom of fasting on these days is also mentioned by Clement of Alexandria³ and by Origen.⁴ Moreover, the two station days were marked by meetings for worship. Tertullian says that a wife with an unbelieving husband has at her side a servant of the devil, 'so that if a station is to be kept (*si statio facienda est*) the husband engages her all day (*de die*) at the baths'.⁵ There would be very little point in this remark unless it was customary for believers to attend some place of worship on those days. Elsewhere he deals with the difficulty of those who think they will be breaking the fast if they partake of the Eucharist on a station day.⁶ 'Will not your station be more solemn', he asks, 'if you have indeed stood in God's house?'⁷ We know that at this time there were fixed prayers at the Eucharist, for on the occasion of the Novatian schism Cyprian wrote a treatise *On the Unity of the Church* in which he speaks of the unauthorized prayers used by the schismatics at their 'false sacrifices'.⁸ According to the later *Testament*

¹ *Simil.* v. 1; P.G. ii. 957.

² *De Jejun.* x, xiv; P.L. ii. 1017, 1024.

³ *Strom.* vii. xii; P.G. ix. 504.

⁴ *Hom. in Levit.* x. 2; P.G. xii. 528. The attitude of the *Didache* finds an echo in this passage. To abstain from food along with the Jews who crucified Christ is not acceptable to God.

⁵ *Ad Uxor.* ii. iv; P.L. i. 1294. *De die* in Tert., *Adv. Nation.* i. vii, *Apol.* vi, *De Anima* xxx, *De Carne* iv, *De Paenit.* xii (quoted in the *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, s.v. 'de', p. 64) always means 'daily', 'from day to day'. It can scarcely have that meaning here. Nor can it be translated 'at daybreak' (Thelwall, in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*). I follow Dodgson (tr. in the *Library of the Fathers*) and Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s.v. 'de', p. 513. But the usage is awkward.

⁶ *De Orat.* xix; P.L. i. 1181: *similiter et stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini.*

⁷ *Ibid.* The word translated 'house' is *ara* in the Latin.

⁸ *De Unit. Eccl.* xvii; P.L. iv. 529: *contemptis episcopis et Dei sacerdotibus derelictis constitutere audet aliud altare, precem alteram illicitis vocibus facere, etc.*

of Our Lord the Eucharist was to be celebrated on Saturdays, Sundays, and fast-days.¹

It is not until Tertullian's time that we hear definitely of vigils, midnight services preparatory to the Eucharist, derived probably from a yearly 'watching' held on Easter eve.² The vigil office was probably held on Sundays and the anniversaries of martyrs at an early date, in addition to the great Pascal vigil. From Tertullian we learn that there were regular vigils—*nocturnae convocationes*, as he calls them.³ The context suggests that these occurred on the station days. It has, therefore, been inferred that every station involved a vigil.⁴ But this was probably true only of those localities in which the Eucharist was celebrated on the station days. For in some places there was no Eucharist on these days. At Alexandria, for instance, 'the Scriptures were read and were interpreted by the doctors; in short, all was done as in the synaxes, except the celebration of the mysteries.'⁵ This is quite definite evidence that the Eucharist was not celebrated at Alexandria. It tallies with what Socrates says elsewhere about the celebration of the Eucharist occurring only on festal days, namely Saturdays and Sundays.⁶ Athanasius speaks of a celebration of the Eucharist on Sunday,⁷ but although he alludes to a regular assembly for public worship on Wednesdays,⁸ there is no mention of the Eucharist. He tells us that 'some of the people were keeping vigil, for a communion was expected', on the night in which he was attacked in the church of Theonas, at Alexandria.⁹ This has been understood as a reference to a Friday vigil, since

¹ *Test.* i. 22; ed. Cooper and Maclean (Edinburgh 1902), p. 69.

² W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship* (Oxford 1936), p. 14; P. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary* (Eng. tr. 1912), pp. 1-3.

³ *Ad Uxor.* II. xiii; P.L. i. 1406.

⁴ Batiffol, op. cit., p. 10.

⁵ Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* v. xxii; P.G. lxvii. 636.

⁶ *Ibid.* vi. viii; P.G. lxvii. 689.

⁷ *Apolog. contra Arian.* § 11; P.G. xxv. 268.

⁸ *Hist. Arian.* § 55; P.G. xxv. 760.

⁹ *Apolog. de fuga sua,* § 24, quoted by Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* II. x; P.G. lxxii. 1024.

Athanasius was attacked in the night of Thursday February 8th to Friday February 9th 356.¹ It is possible that the festival of some martyr was being observed on that Friday in Alexandria, and thus there would naturally be a vigil followed by a Eucharist. The lists of martyrs honoured by the Church differed in different localities,² and the martyrologies dating from before the sixth century are meagre. If, on the other hand, a regular Friday vigil and Eucharist are indicated, it becomes impossible to reconcile Athanasius and Socrates. We are faced by one of those problems of history which it is wiser not to attempt to solve. In any event, there were services of some kind on the station days in Alexandria as in other places. Whether they were Eucharistic or non-Eucharistic must remain a matter of doubt. The probability is that the station did not include the Eucharist, and that the use at Rome was similar to that at Alexandria.³

Thus the Wednesday and Friday stations, reminiscent of the older Jewish observance of Monday and Thursday in the matter of fasting and almsgiving, were also, like them, marked by special acts of worship. In most of the local Churches there were celebrations of the Eucharist, preceded as on Saturdays and Sundays by the reading of Scripture, homilies, psalms, and prayers, which were derived directly from Synagogue practice. In other Churches, for example Alexandria and Rome, it seems that there was no celebration of the Eucharist, and probably the Pro-Anaphora alone formed the service for every station day.

4. *Daily Services*

We have seen that among the early Christians there were services on Sundays, on Saturdays, and on station

¹ Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

² Constantia and Gaza, though only a couple of miles apart and for civil purposes forming one city, had each its own feast days of its own martyrs and commemorations of its own bishops. See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* v. iii; P.G. lxvii. 1221.

³ Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

days, and that the station-day service was not always Eucharistic in form. Clement of Rome is heard in the mists of this obscure age insisting that the Lord Himself commanded 'offerings' to be presented and service (*λειτουργίας*) to be performed at stated times.¹ The distinction between Eucharistic and non-Eucharistic worship implied in this passage is stated explicitly by Tertullian.² But can we go farther and say that the non-Eucharistic prayers were recited daily in public?

All authorities are agreed that there were public assemblies on the days mentioned above. It has been generally assumed that such prayers as were said daily were recited by the faithful in the retirement of their own dwellings.³ But this is, to say the least, doubtful. In Judaism there had been daily sacrifice in the Temple from time immemorial. When synagogues arose in every village and township in Palestine, the institution of the *Ma'amad* linked the services of the Synagogue closely with the daily sacrifices in the Temple.⁴ Therefore, although it may be true that not every tiny village community was able to go *en bloc* daily to the synagogue, at least in the larger towns, where it would be easier to obtain the requisite minimum of ten males and where the homes of the people were grouped more closely around the synagogue, daily attendance at the public worship of the community would be the practice of every devout Jew.⁵ In such a milieu the Christian community arose. Moreover, it is worthy of note that the great centres of the infant Church, in which the Gospel tradition was formulated, were among the larger towns of which we have spoken. Daily services of prayer, morning and evening, would almost certainly be held in the synagogues at

¹ *I Clement xl*; P.G. i. 288.

² *De Cult. Fem. ii. xi*; P.L. i. 1445: *aut sacrificium offertur, aut Dei verbum administratur.*

³ See e.g. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary* (Eng. tr. 1912), p. 10.

⁴ *Vide pp. 16 (supra), 60 (infra).*

⁵ This much is allowed even by Bacher. See his art. 'Synagogue' in *H.D.B.*, vol. iv, p. 642a.

Jerusalem, Caesarea, Antioch, and Rome.¹ And although it is true that large numbers of Gentile converts joined the Church in its early years, necessitating successive modifications of Church practice and the fusion of Semitic with Hellenistic thought, they joined a Church which was essentially Jewish in origin and nucleus.

No doubt there was much divergence of practice among the Christians as there had been among the adherents of Judaism. It appears from other writers that the Jewish origin of much in second-century Church Order had been practically lost sight of by the time the *Apostolic Tradition* came to be written. ‘Hippolytus himself had nothing but contempt for “the People” and their dumb observances. Nor are these Judaic elements obviously developed from Old Testament scripture. They compare for the most part better with the later Jewish pieties of the home, the Synagogue and the *Bēth-ha-midrāsh* than with the earlier Judaism of the Old Testament. Once the temper represented by the *Epistle of Barnabas* and parts of Aristides’ *Apology* had got the upper hand in the Church, the direct borrowing of these things from the Synagogue is very difficult to contemplate. They have, too, as they stand in Hippolytus, in many things been radically Christianised, even though their derivation is still plain, which speaks of long Christian usage.’² Thus the *Apostolic Tradition* gives the kind of direction for attendance at daily worship which the circumstances of the time would lead us to expect:

‘And let every faithful man and woman when they rise from sleep at dawn before they undertake any work wash their hands and pray to God,³ and so let them go to their work. And if there should be

¹ For an interesting study of the early Synagogue liturgy of Rome, and especially its connexion with the Palestinian ritual, see Abraham I. Schechter, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* (Philadelphia 1930).

² Dix, op. cit., p. xlvi.

³ For the Jewish custom of washing before prayer at dawn, see J.E., vol. i, p. 69.

an instruction in the word let each one prefer to go thither, considering that it is God whom he hears speaking by the mouth of him who instructs. For having prayed with (*lit. in*) the Church he will be able to avoid all the evils of that day. The God-fearing man should consider it a great loss if he does not go to the place in which they give instruction, and especially if he knows how to read.¹

'And if there is a day on which there is no instruction let each one at home take a holy book and read in it as well as he can, for it is profitable.'²

This last paragraph seems to suggest that it is the exception which proves the rule. For the deacons and presbyters are ordered to assemble every day unless sickness prevents them. 'And when all have assembled they shall instruct those who are in the assembly (*ἐκκλησία*). And having also prayed, let each one go about his own business.'³ Evidently a congregation was present for them to instruct, and there is no question here of a daily Eucharist, for the *Apostolic Tradition* gives directions elsewhere concerning the daily communion of the laity from the reserved sacrament in their own homes before partaking of food.⁴ Thus Hippolytus, the disciple of Irenaeus, in giving what claimed to be an accurate and authoritative account of the rites and organization of the Church as the men of the later second century had received them from the sub-Apostolic age, regarded prayers and the reading of Scripture at dawn as obligatory on all believers. Those who lived near enough to a church were to hear the public reading and instruction and join in public prayer, before beginning the work of the day: the rest were to pray and read the Scriptures privately.

Prayer in the evening before retiring to bed is also

¹ *Ap. Trad.* xxxv. 1, 2 (Dix, p. 61); Horner, Statute 48 (op. cit., p. 182). Cf. *Ap. Trad.* xxxi. 1, 2 (Dix, pp. 57, 58); Horner, Statute 43 (op. cit., p. 180).

² *Ibid.* xxxvi. 1 (Dix, p. 62); Horner, Statute 48 (op. cit., p. 182).

³ *Ibid.* xxxiii. 2 (Dix, p. 60); Horner, Statute 46 (op. cit., p. 181).

⁴ *Ibid.* xxxii. 1 (Dix, p. 58); Horner, Statute 44 (op. cit., p. 180). Cf. Tert., *Ad Uxor.* II. v; P.L. i. 1408: *Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes, et si sciverit omnem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur?*

enjoined,¹ but nothing is said about public assembly at that hour.² In Alexandria about this time it was regarded as a sacred duty 'before partaking of sleep to give thanks to God' (*εὐχαριστεῖν . . . τῷ Θεῷ*), but Clement's language implies rather private devotion 'before going straight to sleep'.³ Origen refers to the absence of married people at the set times of prayer in the churches.⁴ That he has in mind daily services will appear in a moment. A century and a half later the origin of the evening prayer in church was almost forgotten. Already it was referred to as something of immemorial antiquity:

'I will now add what perhaps would be otherwise too insignificant to adduce, but on account of its antiquity is required for the refutation of him who accuses us of novelty. It seemed good to our fathers not to receive in silence the gift of light at eventide, but as soon as it appeared to return thanks. Who was the author of those words of thanksgiving at the lighting of the lamps we are unable to say; the people, however, use the old form, and no one ever thought them guilty of impiety for saying, We praise Father, Son and God's Holy Spirit.'⁵

Tertullian,⁶ Origen,⁷ Chrysostom,⁸ and Jerome,⁹ in common with most of the Fathers, insist that the whole life of the true Christian is one continuous prayer; and in this connexion the three last named refer to St. Paul's exhortation to 'pray without ceasing' (1 Thes. v. 17). Nevertheless, they are all agreed that definite hours of prayer should be observed. Tertullian gives his backing to the custom, which was coming in in his time, of holding prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day.¹⁰ But he adds that

¹ *Ap. Trad.* xxxvi. 7 (Dix, p. 65); Horner, Statute 48 (op. cit., p. 183).

² For an account of the *Lucernarium*, or bringing-in of lamps at the supper of the congregation (*Ap. Trad.* xxvi. 18–32, Dix, pp. 50–2) *vide infra*, pp. 50 et seq.

³ *Paedagog.* II. iv; P.G. viii. 444.

⁴ Origen, *Comment. in Epist. ad Rom.* ix. 1; P.G. xiv. 1205: *illi qui in coniugii positi sunt, et ex consensu ad tempus vacant orationi.*

⁵ Basil, *De Spirit. Sanct.* xxix. 73; P.G. xxxii. 205.

⁶ *De Orat.* xxiii (end); P.L. i. 1299. ⁷ *De Orat.* xii; P.G. xi. 452.

⁸ *In Epist. ad Ephes.* Cap. vi *Hom.* xxiv. 3; P.G. lxii. 172.

⁹ *Ep.* xxii. 37; P.L. xxii. 421.

¹⁰ *Vide infra*, pp. 60, 66.

these times of prayer should be 'of course quite apart from the regular prayers which without any reminder are due at the beginning of day and of night'.¹ Now this phrase is of the utmost significance. Prayer in the morning and in the evening is obviously taken for granted. He speaks of it as an established custom,² a duty which no one may neglect. It needs no proof texts from Scripture to give it authority, because it has already been customary for generations. Here, indeed, is the original tradition of the early Church. No grounds, moreover, exist for assuming with some scholars that the morning and evening prayers were purely private devotions.³ Tertullian does not state whether he is discussing private or public prayer, and it is quite impossible, on the basis of this passage alone, to say which type of devotion he is describing. Cyprian insists that, in addition to the prayers at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, 'we must also pray early in the morning (*mane*), that the Lord's resurrection may be celebrated by morning (*matutina*) prayer'.⁴ After quoting Ps. v. 2 and Hos. vi. 1 in justification of this practice, he proceeds: 'also at the sunsetting and at the decline of day of necessity we must pray again'.⁵ Cyprian, like Tertullian, gives us no information as to the place of prayer at these hours. Taken by themselves their remarks might be thought to refer to purely private devotions, but when they are considered in the light of the evidence already adduced, the *a priori* grounds for expecting that such services would be held in common as a general rule, and the very definite witness of the contemporary Origen that they were so held, these straws blowing in the wind carry us on to the conviction that daily services of prayer commonly took place

¹ *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300 (foot): *exceptis utique legitimis orationibus, quae sine ulla admonitione debentur ingressu lucis et noctis.*

² *Omnis die quis dubitet prostertere se Deo, vel prima saltem oratione qua lucem ingreditur.*

³ e.g. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary* (Eng. tr. 1912), p. 10.

⁴ *De Orat. Domin.* xxxv; P.L. iv. 560.

⁵ *Ibid.* *Recedente item sole ac die cessante necessario rursus orandum est.*

in the Church as well as in the Synagogue. For Origen says in one of his strikingly modern sermons:

"Tell me, you who only on festivals (*festis diebus*) come together at church, are not the other days festal (*festi*)? are they not days of the Lord? It is a custom of the Jews to observe as solemn days certain rare days. And therefore God says to them: Your new moons and sabbaths and great day I cannot abide; your fasts and festivals my soul hateth (Is. l. 13-14). Therefore God hates those who think one day is the festal day of the Lord. Christians eat the flesh of the Lamb on every day, that is they daily partake of the flesh of the word of God."¹

At first sight this passage reads like a reference to a daily Eucharist. But it should be noted that the context is not dealing with the Eucharist: it deals rather with the hearing of sermons and Scripture lections. Further, the phrases *carnes agni comedunt*, *carnes verbi Dei sumunt* must represent a Greek original different from that which is rendered by the phrase *corpus Christi communicare*. It is this latter phrase which is always used in the Latin version when Origen is speaking of the Eucharist.² In the passage which we are considering we see unrolled before our eyes the vista of a great church in fashionable Alexandria, somewhat sparsely filled by a crowd of worldly-minded men who do not pay attention to the service because they are more concerned with striking bargains and adding up accounts.³ The women, too, come in for gossip and scandal which brings forth for them the bitter sarcasm of the preacher.⁴ But there is no doubt that it is a daily service which is taking place; and from start to finish in these sermons the emphasis is upon the reading of Scripture, instruction, and

¹ *Hom. in Gen.* x. 3; P.G. xii. 218. The last sentence runs thus: *Christiani omni die carnes agni comedunt, id est carnes verbi Dei sumunt.* Cf. *Hom. in Exod.* vii. 8; P.G. xii. 349 where the phrase *carnes verbi Dei comedere* occurs again and is explained as *verbum Dei quod in Ecclesia praedicatur*.

² e.g. *In Ps. xxxvii Hom.* ii. 6; P.G. xii. 1386: *Communicare non times corpus Christi, accedens ad Eucharistiam, quasi mundus est purus, quasi nihil in te sit indignum, et in his omnibus putas quod effugias judicium Dei?*

³ Cf. Origen, *Hom. in Exod.* xii. 2; P.G. xii. 383.

⁴ *Hom. in Exod.* xiii. 3; P.G. xii. 390.

prayer. 'Is there not sadness and groaning in it [the Church] when you do not come together to hear the word of God', says the preacher, 'and scarcely on festivals (*festis diebus*) proceed to church?'¹ Or again:

'This is the instruction of souls, and spiritual doctrine, which trained thee up, and teaches that you should come daily to the wells of the Scriptures (*puteos Scripturarum*), to the waters of the Holy Spirit.'²

Those who decline to hear the word of God are described as not desiring 'the bread of life nor living water', and a pretty simile styles them unwilling to go forth from the camp, to leave their worthless dwellings, to collect for themselves manna. Evidently daily prayer in Alexandria was not mere private devotion at the close of the second century. It was quite permissible for the individual to offer the prayers wherever he could enjoy quietness and be undisturbed.³ But that does not alter the fact that services were held daily in the churches.

There is no good reason for assuming that things were otherwise in North Africa or in Rome. Cyprian declares that prayer is public and common,⁴ for 'before all things the Teacher of peace and the Master of unity would not have prayer to be made singly and individually'.⁵ The very fact that Jesus taught us to pray 'Our Father . . .' and not 'My Father . . .' constituted a command to pray for all in common prayer and united supplication.⁶ It is surely not fantastic to suggest that it was this 'common prayer and united supplication' which Tertullian described as

¹ *Hom. in Gen.* x. 1; P.G. xii. 215.

² *Ibid.* x. 2; P.G. xii. 216; cf. *ibid.* x. 3; P.G. xii. 217. For lections and sermons styled as 'the blood of Christ' see Origen, *Hom. in Num.* xvi. 9; P.G. xii. 701. See the section on lections, *infra*, pp. 86-7.

³ Origen, *De Orat.* xxxi; P.G. xi. 553.

⁴ *De Orat. Domin.* viii; P.L. iv. 541: *Publica est nobis et communis oratio; et quando oramus non pro uno sed pro toto populo oramus, quia totus populus unum sumus.*

⁵ *Ibid.* Collective prayer was an essentially Jewish characteristic.

⁶ Cyprian, *Ep.* vii. 7; P.L. iv. 250: *oratione communi et concordi prece.*

'the regular prayers which without any reminder are due at the beginning of day and of night'.¹

A generation later Arnobius wrote an *Apology* in which he endeavoured to refute the attacks of paganism, and to commend Christianity to its enemies. In this book he tells the Christians that their opponents are not hostile to them because they worship One God instead of many, 'but because you contend that one born a man and put to death on the cross . . . was God . . . and because you worship Him in daily supplications'.² Lactantius has no information for us on the subject.³ An *Apocalypse* which was very popular in the West, and which probably appeared towards the close of the fourth century, though it is made up very largely of early matter in the opinion of M. R. James, urged prayer at the hour of sunset and at the hour of morning.⁴ And although Augustine may have laughed at the folly of someone who had forged the *Apocalypse of Paul* (Augustine, *In Joann. Evang. Tract.* xcvi), yet he tells us that his own mother kept these very hours of prayer in church every day.⁵

Turning once more to the East, but this time to Syria and Palestine, we find that public prayer at the lighting of the lamps and at daybreak was customary in the middle of the fourth century. A pilgrim who visited the holy places about A.D. 385–8 has left us a detailed description of the daily services of prayer in the Anastasis of Jerusalem.⁶

¹ *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300. *Vide supra*, p. 47.

² *Adv. Gent.* i. xxxvi; P.L. v. 759: *et quotidianis supplicationibus adoratis*. Cf. *ibid.*; P.L. v. 748: *quotidianis ei precibus supplicari*.

³ He merely refers to prayer at the first hour of the day as something to be taken for granted. See *Div. Inst.* iv. xxviii; P.L. vi. 556.

⁴ *Apocalypse of Paul* vii; in *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 528.

⁵ Augustine, *Confess.* v. ix (§ 17); P.L. xxxii. 714: *nullum diem praetermittentis oblationem ad altare tuum; bis in die, mane et vespere, ad ecclesiam tuam sine ulla intermissione venientis, non ut vanas fabulas et aniles locquacitates, sed ut te audiret in tuis sermonibus, et tu illam in suis orationibus*.

⁶ The *Peregrinatio Etheriae*, which was first published by Gamurrini in 1887. The Latin text is printed in Duchesne, *Christian Worship* (London 1923), p. 492 et seq.

In her journal she describes a service at the tenth hour (*quod appellant hic licinicon, nam nos dicimus lucernare*), and another at dawn (*ubi coeperit lucescere*), as well as other services during the day. The services of the hours are obviously of a monastic nature. Indeed, Etheria states that the *monazontes* and *parthenae* regularly assembled at these hours in the basilica. But at the evening and morning services the laity were also present; at these times the bishop attended; and, as Batiffol has pointed out, 'a distinction is drawn in favour of *vespers* and *lauds*, as if these offices, which identify themselves with the morning and evening prayer, had a character of obligation which the *nocturn* does not possess. In fact, the *nocturn*, or, to speak more accurately, the daily vigil, is an office attended only by a few of the faithful in addition to those who make profession of asceticism. But there is a crowded congregation at *vespers*, and, as it would seem, at *lauds* also.'¹ The special importance attached to these times of prayer is best explained on the hypothesis that they represent the tradition of the primitive Church at Jerusalem, derived directly from Synagogue practice and continued throughout that obscure period of which we have few, if any, records, until they became incorporated in the monastic Hours of prayer sometime in the fourth century.

About this time, at Antioch, a great preacher was insisting, like Origen at Alexandria before him, that daily prayers should be offered every morning and evening.² Chrysostom, like Origen, was speaking to a congregation, and his concern was for public worship, not private devotion. This is evident from his reference to the reading of Scripture and the homily which he was even then delivering upon it.³ Ignatius, who held the see of Antioch about

¹ *History of the Roman Breviary* (Eng. tr. 1912), p. 17.

² Chrysostom, *In Epist. ad Heb. Cap. viii Hom. xiv. 4*; P.G. lxiii. 116: Διὰ τοῦτο εὐχῆς ἡμῖν δεῖ μάλιστα ἐωθινῆς καὶ νυκτερινῆς. Cf. *In Epist. ad Heb. Cap. xi Hom. xxii. 3*; P.G. lxiii. 158: κανὸν ταῖς ἐωθιναῖς κανὸν ταῖς ἐσπεριναῖς.

³ *In Epist. II ad Thess. Cap. ii Hom. iii. 4*; P.G. lxii. 485–6.

A.D. 110, had written letters to the Churches of Asia Minor, in which he urged them to be more constant in attendance all together at public worship.¹ The language of these letters is quite general, and, though there is nothing in them which asserts that prayer took place at the hours spoken of by Origen and Chrysostom, there is also nothing of a contrary nature. For the period between Ignatius and Chrysostom we have the curious document known as *The Testament of our Lord*,² which was probably compiled in Asia Minor or Syria about A.D. 350.³ The view of Funk and Achelis that the *Testament* was directly derived from the 'Egyptian Church Order' has been confirmed by Schwartz and Connolly, and the two last-named have further demonstrated the identity of the 'Egyptian Church Order' with the lost *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.⁴ The compiler of the *Testament* greatly expanded Hippolytus' prescriptions by the addition of much material from other sources, but where he used the *Apostolic Tradition* he was careful to employ an excellent codex.⁵ His accurate retention of whole verses of this work suggests that he was aiming at preserving for the men of his generation the tradition of the Church in matters of worship. It is therefore probable that the other passages in the *Testament* record customs which were already of some antiquity. The document is, thus, a link between Ignatius and Chrysostom in that it gives us the actual prayers used in the Levant during the obscure intervening period. Among those prayers there occurs a Hymn of Praise for the Dawn, preceded by a rubric which reads, 'At early dawn let the bishop assemble the people, so that the service may be finished before the rising of the sun (*lit.* until the sun

¹ *Ad Magnes.* vii. 1, 2; P.G. v. 765. Cf. *Ad Ephes.* v. 1; P.G. v. 736.

² Published in a Syriac version by Mgr. Ephraim Rahmani, *Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi* (Mainz 1899).

³ J. Cooper and A. J. Maclean, *Testament of Our Lord* (Edinburgh 1902), pp. 41, 45.

⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 33.

⁵ Dix, *op. cit.*, p. lxvii.

riseth).¹ This is a most striking parallel to the Rabbinic rule cited in the Mishnah which orders the *Shema'* to be recited in the morning as soon as one can distinguish between blue and white, or blue and green, 'and it should be finished before sunrise'.² In the Synagogue liturgy the *Shema'* was preceded by a Benediction for the gift of light. This prayer was said daily at dawn, and it was not considered necessary to give explicit directions to that effect either in a prayer-book rubric or in the Mishnah. It was simply taken for granted. Similarly, in the Church, a hymn of praise for the dawn would naturally be recited at every dawn. It is, therefore, difficult to understand the point of Cooper and Maclean's note, on the probable order of service at dawn, that 'none of it is appointed to be said daily, the Eucharist expressly not daily',³ and their comment that the *Testament* 'lays down no formal public daily prayers for all men'.⁴ If the Eucharist is ordered 'expressly not daily', the presumption is that the other prayers are daily. The 'Egyptian Church Order', from which the *Testament* is directly derived, had already given directions for daily assembly of the people at dawn for prayer and instruction in the Scriptures, but without giving any indication of the form of prayer which was used. This was now supplied by the compiler of the *Testament*, together with directions to the presbyters to say the daily hymn of praise in the church in rotation.⁵ Our document contains instructions for the celebration of the Eucharist: 'Let the offering only be on Saturday, or on the first day of the week, and on a fast day'.⁶ The bishop is to 'offer on Saturday three loaves for a complete symbol of the Trinity; but on the first day of the week let him offer four loaves for a complete symbol of the Gospel'.⁷ A liturgy for use on these days follows. At early dawn the bishop is to assemble

¹ *Test.* i. 26.

² *Ber.* i. 2.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 164. Note on chapter 23.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 189. Note on chapter 32.

⁵ i. 32.

⁶ i. 22.

⁷ i. 23.

the people: the hymn of praise for the dawn is recited; psalms and hymns are sung; the Scriptures are read and a homily is delivered; prayers are offered. After the dismissal of the catechumens, the Anaphora of the Eucharist begins. It is evident that the service on Saturdays, Sundays, and fast-days consisted of the Pro-Anaphora followed by the Anaphora. But it seems probable that the Pro-Anaphora alone was recited at dawn on all other days. In a later chapter of the *Testament* the presbyters are ordered by a rubric to say the daily hymn of praise in the church in rotation.¹ If this passage be read through it will be apparent that we have here a shortened form of the Pro-Anaphora which occurs earlier (i. 26). There are the same invocations, the same thanksgiving for light, the same triple hymn of praise, though the wording is somewhat different. Moreover, the people must have been present at this Office, since responses are provided for them, as in the fuller Eucharistic Pro-Anaphora. It is impossible to maintain, with Cooper and Maclean, that 'there appears to have been no fixed time for these prayers'.² If there were no fixed hour of prayer, how would the people know when to attend? The *Testament* orders the hymn of praise to be said before sunrise when a Eucharist follows. It is reasonable to suppose that the daily hymn of praise was offered at the same hour when a Eucharist did not follow.³

We have digressed far from our consideration of Ignatius and Chrysostom. But the twofold distinction in Church worship which has emerged from our discussion of the *Testament of Our Lord* finds an echo in a sermon of Chrysostom, written perhaps half a century later than the *Testament*. The preacher is trying to meet the difficulties of those who say that while in church they are full of

¹ i. 32.

² Op. cit., p. 189.

³ It is worth noting that in connexion with the prayer for one who is late in coming into church the Pro-Anaphora and the Anaphora are regarded as separate entities (i. 36).

zeal, but their zeal is quenched when they are away from church.

'That this then may not be the case, when you depart from the assembly (*ἀπὸ συνάξεως ἀναχωρῶν*), you must account nothing more necessary than the putting together of the things that have been spoken. For indeed it would be the utmost folly, for those who give up five and even six days to the business of this life not to give to things spiritual so much as one day, or rather not so much as a small part of one day. Do you not see our own children, that whatever lessons are given them, those they study throughout the whole day? This, then, let us do likewise, since otherwise we shall derive no profit from coming here, drawing water each day into a vessel with holes.'¹

This contradictory passage, with its mention first of one day only and then of 'each day', seems to be explicable only on the hypothesis that Chrysostom is speaking in the first instance of the Sunday Eucharist, and in the second of the daily assemblies for prayer, reading, and exhortation.

In the East it has never been customary to offer the Eucharist daily, but our discussion of the daily services of the early Church would not be complete without a reference to the daily Eucharist which became common in the West at a fairly early date.

In the North African Church c. A.D. 200 the Eucharist was certainly celebrated on Sundays and station days,² but Tertullian's reference to the custom of reserving the consecrated bread on the station days and carrying it home (cf. Cyprian, *De Lapsis* xxv) to partake of it before ordinary food³ seems to militate against the theory of a daily Eucharist in that region. On the other hand, Cyprian speaks of the priests celebrating the sacrifices of God daily,⁴ and of

¹ In *Matt. Hom.* v. 1; P.G. lvii. 55. The last sentence runs: ἐπεὶ πλέον οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἔσται τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἀφίξεως, εἰς πίθον τετρημένον ἀντλοῦσι καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν κ.τ.λ. The language recalls the metaphors of Origen in a similar connexion: *vide supra*, p. 49.

² Tertullian, *De Orat.* xix; P.L. i. 1286.

³ *Ad Uxor.* II. v; P.L. i. 1408.

⁴ *Ep. liv.* 3; P.L. iii. 884: *ut sacerdotes qui sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus.*

the people drinking the cup of Christ daily.¹ It is possible that the custom was just coming in at this time in the North African Church. Hence the discussion about the proper hour for holding the service, in which some maintained that the sacrifice ought to be offered in the evening, because the Lord offered the mixed cup not in the morning but in the evening.² Cyprian pointed out that at this hour the whole of the people could not be gathered together 'so as to celebrate the truth of the sacrament in the presence of all the brethren'.³ It was fitting for Christ to celebrate the Last Supper in the evening, 'but we celebrate the resurrection of the Lord in the morning'.⁴ 'And we ask that this bread should be given to us daily, that we who are in Christ, and daily receive the Eucharist for the food of salvation may not be separated from Christ's Body'.⁵

In the next century the daily Eucharist was regarded as the normal rule in North Africa,⁶ as well as in Italy,⁷ and had spread to the Church in Spain.⁸ Augustine, like Cyprian before him, wrote and preached on the subject of the Lord's Prayer. He remarks that it is a duty to partake of the daily bread of the Lord's Supper every day, in spite of the views of those in Eastern parts who do not follow this custom.⁹ Yet even Augustine regards the daily Pro-Anaphora, the old non-Eucharistic service of prayer which had probably become permanently attached to the

¹ *Ep.* lvi. 1; P.L. iv. 360.

² Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii. 16; P.L. iv. 398.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵ Cyprian, *De Orat. Domin.* xviii; P.L. iv. 549.

⁶ Augustine, *Sermones (passim)*.

⁷ Ambrose, *Ep.* xx. 15; P.L. xvi. 1040. Ambrosiaster, *De Sacramentis*, v. iv. 25; P.L. xvi. 471.

⁸ Council of Toledo (A.D. 400), Canon 5: *vide Hefele, Histoire des Conciles* (Paris 1907-), tom. ii. 1, p. 123.

⁹ *De serm. Dom. in monte*, II. vii. 26; P.L. xxxiv. 1280. For the celebration of the Eucharist on Sundays only, in Egypt, and at Constantinople, see Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arian.* § 11; P.G. xxv. 268, and Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i. xiii; P.G. lxxxii. 949.

Anaphora in the West by this time, as being of equal importance with the Anaphora. For the *competentes* the Pro-Anaphora is the only service, and they are not to neglect it after they have been baptized. Homilizing on Mt. vi. 11, he says the petition 'Give us this day our daily bread' cannot refer to ordinary food, because both good and bad receive this food from God, and proceeds:

'Thinkest thou there is no other bread for which the children ask, of which the Lord said in the Gospel "It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs"? Yes, surely there is. What then is that bread? and why is it called daily? . . . there is a daily bread for which the children pray. That is the word of God which is dealt out to us day by day.'¹ . . . Our daily food then in this earth is the word of God which is dealt out always in the churches;² our hire after labour is eternal life. Again, if by this our daily bread you understand what the faithful (*fideles*) receive, what you shall receive when you have been baptized, it is with good reason that we ask and say "Give us this day our daily bread" that we may so live as not to be separated from that altar.'³

In this passage the equation of the daily bread with the Eucharist is the third interpretation, and in other passages the three interpretations given above are repeated.⁴ The daily hearing of the word is, then, as much part of the Christian act of worship as partaking of the Eucharist itself; and the two things are not synonymous. This is the more remarkable when we consider the comparatively late date at which Augustine was speaking.

Our conclusion is that from the very beginning daily services modelled on the ritual of the Synagogue were common both in the East and in the West, although there may have been some localities which did not follow the general custom of the Church. This service, which formed

¹ *Ipse est sermo Dei, qui nobis quotidie erogatur.*

² *Cibus noster quotidianus in hac terra sermo Dei est, qui semper erogatur ecclesiis.*

³ Augustine, *Sermo LVI. vi* (§ 10); P.L. xxxviii. 381.

⁴ *Sermo LVII. vii* (§ 7); P.L. xxxviii. 389; *Sermo LVIII. iv* (§ 5); P.L. xxxviii. 395; *Sermo LIX. iii* (§ 6); P.L. xxxviii. 401; *De serm. Dom. in monte*, II. vii. 25; P.L. xxxiv. 1280.

the Pro-Anaphora of the Eucharist when the mysteries were celebrated, existed from the earliest times as a separate service and was recited without the Anaphora on weekdays both in the East and in the West. A daily Eucharist was introduced in the West, possibly in Rome or North Africa at the beginning of the third century, and this usage was followed in certain isolated districts in the East,¹ but never became universal.² Finally, with the institution of a daily Mass in the West and the rise of monasticism in the East and in the West, the old daily services, which for the sake of clearness have been called the Pro-Anaphora, became on the one hand the Ordinary of the Mass, and on the other took their place in the developed monastic Hours as *Vespers* and *Lauds*. It remains to trace the story of these Hours and to determine, if we can, the contents of the daily prayers from which they arose.

¹ e.g. at Constantinople, where Chrysostom complained of the absence of communicants at the Eucharist (*In Epist. ad Ephes. Cap. i Hom. iii. 4; P.G. lxii. 20; In Epist. ad Heb. Cap. x Hom. xvii. 3, 4; P.G. lxiii. 131, 132*). Evidently the innovation did not prove successful. Jerome gave it as his opinion (*Ep. lxxi. 6; P.L. xxii. 672*), when asked whether the Eucharist ought to be received daily 'according to the custom which is currently reported of the churches of Rome and Spain', that 'each province may follow its own inclination, and the traditions of ancestors should be regarded as apostolic laws'.

² Augustine (*Ep. (ad Januarium) liv. 2; P.L. xxxiii. 200*) provides evidence that in some places the Eucharist was offered daily, in others on Saturdays and Sundays, and in others on Sundays only.

CHAPTER IV

GROWTH OF THE CANONICAL HOURS

THE subject of the Canonical Hours is so vast that any detailed discussion of it would require a separate treatise. Moreover, the Hours were only developed under the influence of monasticism: their history belongs to a period later than that with which we are primarily concerned. Nevertheless, the seeds which afterwards bore fruit are embedded in the soil we are endeavouring to turn up, and our survey would not be complete without taking them into account.

For the origin of daily hours of prayer we must turn once again to the practice of Judaism. There is much confusion, both in the Rabbinic writings and among modern scholars, concerning the growth of the Synagogue services and their relation to the services of the Temple. This subject has been briefly discussed in an earlier chapter.¹ But certain points now call for further consideration.

The custom of offering a daily burnt-offering in the Temple at Jerusalem was based on the command in Ex. xxix. 38–42 and Num. xxviii. 1–8. The rule in these passages requires a burnt-offering and cereal oblation both morning and evening. The morning sacrifice was offered between dawn and sunrise;² the evening sacrifice between sunset and dark, ‘between the two evenings’ (Ex. xxix. 39).³

¹ *Vide supra*, pp. 11–25.

² *Tamid* iii. 2.

³ For the phrase בֵּין שְׁעָרִים of M.T. the Targ. Onk. reads נֶשְׁמַח אֲבֹתָה בֵּין שְׁעָרִים and the Targ. Jon. בֵּין שְׁמַחְתָּא. Both Targums use the same phrase in the verse וּבְהַעֲלֵת אַפְּרִן אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ בֵּין שְׁעָרִים וּג' (Ex. xxx. 8). It is scarcely likely that Aaron would kindle the lamps before twilight came on. See further the examples in Levy, *Wör. über die Targ.* (Leipzig 1881), s.v. שְׁמַחְתָּא. The LXX translates by πρὸς ἐσπέραν, τὸ δειλυόν, ὅμει, and only in Lv. xxviii. 5 ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἐσπεριών. In our passage (Ex. xxix. 39) LXX has τὸ δειλυόν, which may be construed adverbially ‘at even’. LXX employs the same phrase to translate בֵּין שְׁעָרִים in Lv. vi. 20. It cannot, then, reflect the custom of offering the sacrifice at the hour of the sun’s decline, which was a later innovation. See A. H. McNeile, *Exodus*

In the Herodian Temple, however, the 'evening' offering on ordinary days was between three and four o'clock in the afternoon.¹ As the daily burnt-offering was made for the people, the people were represented at it each morning and evening by a deputation appointed for the purpose.² It was out of this institution of the *Ma'amad*, involving public assembly at the same hour in the village whence the deputation came, that the Synagogue services arose.³ Now the practice of saying the *Shema'* every morning and evening was an established custom long before the priests of the Herodian Temple put back the time of the evening sacrifice from sunset to the middle of the afternoon.⁴ The connexion between the original hours of the daily sacrifice in the Temple and the original Synagogue services at the beginning and end of the day is clear. In the Church of the early third century these hours were still being observed as regular times of prayer.⁵

But Tertullian recommends also prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day,⁶ while the *Didache* orders the Lord's Prayer to be recited three times daily.⁷ Harnack was uncertain whether the author of the *Didache* had in mind the third, sixth, and ninth hours, or whether he was thinking of morning, afternoon, and evening as times of prayer based on the Jewish custom of saying the *Shemōneh 'Esrēh* morning, afternoon, and evening.⁸ Harnack regarded it as worthy of notice that Origen (*De Orat.* xii) also speaks of prayer three times in the day, and names morning, noon, and evening, not the third, sixth, and ninth

(Westminster Commentaries), p. 69. Cf. G. F. Moore, *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (London 1899-1903), p. 4209.

¹ *Pešahim* v. 1.

² *Vide supra*, p. 16.

³ *Vide supra*, pp. 16, 43.

⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 17.

⁵ Tert., *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300-1: *legitimis orationibus, quae sine ulla admonitione debentur ingressu lucis et noctis.* *Vide supra*, p. 47.

⁶ *Vide supra*, p. 46.

⁷ viii. 3; *τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας οὐτως προσεύχεσθε.*

⁸ In his large edition of the *Didache* (1884) *ad loc.*: noted by Holtzmann, 'Die täglichen Gebetsstunden im Judentum und Urchristentum' in *Z.N.T.W.*, 1911, p. 90.

hours; but he offered nothing conclusive on the subject. Drews suggested, in his notes on the *Didache*,¹ that the practice of saying the Lord's Prayer three times daily should not be referred to the later Christian Hours of Prayer (third, sixth, and ninth hours), but to the Jewish custom of praying the *Shemōneh 'Esreh* every morning, noon, and evening. He also thought it possible that the Jewish-Christians were accustomed still to pray the *Shemōneh 'Esreh* at their Hours of Prayer. Holtzmann rightly pointed out that the latter statement could scarcely be correct, since the Eighteen Benedictions as such date from the period after the destruction of Jerusalem.² Nevertheless, those Benedictions which are pre-Christian may well have been incorporated in Christian hymns and prayers.

Holtzmann noted, further, the discrepancy between Harnack's statement, following Schürer, that the Jewish times of prayer were morning, afternoon, and evening, and Drews' assertion that they were morning, noon, and evening. He considered that Drews had good grounds for his assertion. Let us suppose for the moment that this view is correct, and that the Christian custom of prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours was based on the Jewish habit of prayer at those hours. How are we to account for the *legitima orationes* at dawn and sunset which Tertullian regarded as obligatory, and which are included in the scheme of daily prayers in the *Apostolic Tradition*, with special emphasis on the prayer at dawn? Were these purely Christian invention? In his anxiety to show the similarity between the third, sixth, and ninth hour prayers and the Jewish custom of praying thrice daily, Holtzmann neglected the prayers at dawn and sunset, and propounded the theory of two arrangements of the Jewish hours of prayer, one original and the other late.³ In Jerusalem, he thought, they kept to

¹ In Hennecke's *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1904, p. 269—not p. 268 as Holtzmann asserts.

² Op. cit., p. 91. See further pp. 22–5 above, and the table on pp. 114–25.

³ Op. cit., pp. 104–7.

the use of the Temple as long as it was standing, and prayed the last daily prayer at three o'clock, having said the mid-day prayer at noon. This arrangement he found in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts iii. 1; x. 3, 4, 30; x. 9). In the Diaspora and after the Fall of the Temple they either kept to the earlier custom of praying morning, noon, and evening,¹ or they changed the times so that the *Minhāh* prayer was put at three o'clock instead of at noon and the evening prayer remained the same. So the two orders of prayer remained side by side amongst the Jews till after Epiphanius (cf. *Adv. Haer.* xxix. 9). By the authority of the Mishnah the older form was ultimately suppressed. On the other hand, the Church kept the prayer at the sixth hour, besides the prayers at the third and ninth hours.

This explanation is far from satisfactory. It is true that the original times of morning and evening, at which the daily burnt-offerings were offered in the Temple, were altered to morning and afternoon in the Herodian Temple. We have the evidence of R. Joshua b. Hananiah, who lived in Jerusalem during the existence of the Temple and survived its fall:

‘When we rejoiced [during Tabernacles] at the joy of the Water-drawing we saw no sleep with our eyes. Why so? The first hour, the morning *Tāmid* (sacrifice), and thence to the prayer; thence to the *Mūṣāf* (additional) offering, thence to the *Mūṣāf* prayer;² thence

¹ His evidence for this so-called earlier custom is weak in the extreme. Holtzmann cites Ps. lv. 18: ‘evening, morning, and at noonday will I complain and moan.’ There is here no reference to the Temple, and if it be a question of synagogal prayer, one could as well deduce a cycle of seven daily prayers from Ps. cxix. 164. His reference to ‘*Amidāh* xviii is equally unhappy. It now reads: ‘We give thanks to Thee . . . for Thy wonders and Thy benefits that are wrought at all times, evening, morning and noon.’ Here again there is no reference to worship at the times mentioned, and the whole phrase is missing from the old Palestinian version, which goes back to pre-Christian times (*vide infra*, p. 123).

² Besides the regular sacrifices offered in the Temple, the Law provided for additional offerings to be brought on festivals. These were brought after the regular morning offering. The *Mūṣāf* or additional prayer was introduced into the Synagogue to take the place of these sacrifices (b.Ber. 26b).

to the House of Study, thence to the meal; thence to the afternoon prayer, thence to the evening *Tāmid*. (*lit.* the *Tāmid* which belongs to between the evenings); thence onwards to the joy of the water-drawing.¹

The ninth hour is mentioned by Josephus as the time of the evening sacrifice,² and the Mishnah defines this more closely as 'a half after the ninth hour'.³ Holtzmann suggested that the change from sunset to about 3.30 in the afternoon may have been made owing to the great claims on the priests' time caused by the increasing number of visitors who offered sacrifices in the Herodian Temple, coupled with the increasing indolence of the priesthood.⁴ After the offering of the sacrifice the Temple doors were closed, and the service of the priest was ended for the day.⁵

Whatever the reason for the change in the time of the Temple sacrifices may have been, the Synagogue retained the old custom of reciting the *Shema'* at dawn and at sunset. This declaration of faith was so intimately connected with the beginning and end of the day, both by custom and by the wording of the Benedictions which accompanied it, that it could only properly be recited at those times. The Mishnaic ruling that it might be said 'until the third hour, for so is the custom of kings to rise at the third hour'⁶ merely brought it into relation with the beginning of the day for *them*. It was a concession to the laxity of the leisured classes.⁷

But now there was added to the liturgy of the Synagogue the '*Amīdāh* (or *Tefillāh*), 'to correspond with the daily whole-offerings'.⁸ This prayer, which later consisted of Eighteen Benedictions, originated in Maccabean or even pre-Maccabean times, as we have seen.⁹ Under the

¹ b.Suk. 53a.

² Ant. xiv. iv. 3.

³ Pešah. v. 1.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 102.

⁶ Ber. i. 2.

⁵ Josephus, *Contr. Apion.* II. viii (§ 105), ix (§ 119).

⁷ Similarly, in the Temple, the morning whole burnt-offering could be brought until the fourth hour, or even midday, in Herodian times (b.Ber. 26b).

⁸ b.Ber. 26b.

⁹ *Vide supra*, pp. 22-5, and the table on pp. 114-25.

influence of the Pharisees the recitation of this prayer at the hours of the morning and afternoon sacrifices became compulsory. Since there was no longer a sacrifice in the Temple at sunset the recitation of the '*Amidāh*' in the evening remained voluntary until Rabban Gamaliel II (c. A.D. 90–110) made it obligatory.¹

Thus three stages can be traced in the development of the liturgy: first, the Decalogue and *Shema'* with their Benedictions at sunrise and dusk: then the '*Amidāh*' was added in the morning and recited without them in the afternoon, while the *Shema'*, &c., continued to be said in the evening: lastly, the *Shema'* and '*Amidāh*' became the norm for morning and evening prayer, and the '*Amidāh*' for that of the afternoon, as they have remained in the Synagogue down to the present day. It should be noted that at no time in the history of Judaism has the *Shema'* been recited as part of the afternoon prayer. Moreover, there is no evidence that there was ever a midday prayer in the Synagogue, or an offering of a regular daily sacrifice at that hour in the Temple.²

Thus the suggestion that the Christian prayers at the third, sixth, and ninth hours were modelled on Jewish practice is not founded on fact. Neither the times of the Jewish prayers nor their content would lead us to suppose that this is correct.

That the first pouring of the Holy Spirit on the assembled disciples took place at the third hour (Acts ii. 15) was noted by Tertullian.³ But the passage in Acts contains no reference to prayer. It merely states that the disciples were 'all together in one place', and Peter's rebuttal of the charge of drunkenness would have carried far more weight had he been able to assert that they were engaged in the customary morning prayer. Instead he was only able to

¹ b.Ber. 27b.

² Except when the early morning sacrifice may have been postponed to that hour, as noted above.

³ *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300.

offer the obvious remark that it was 'but the third hour of the day'. Again, Tertullian's observation¹ that 'at the sixth hour Peter went up upon the house-top to pray' (Acts x. 9) does not presuppose a regular time of prayer. It need cause no surprise if Peter offered private prayers at the hour when 'a darkness came over the whole land' (Lk. xxiii. 44) and his Master entered the Valley of the Shadow.² Moreover, we have seen that the Rabbinic literature knows nothing of a regular sixth-hour prayer either in the Temple or in the Synagogue. Peter's entry into the Temple with John at the ninth hour (Acts iii. 1) was doubtless in order to be present at the afternoon prayer and sacrifice, but Tertullian himself notes that 'these facts are simply stated without any command about the practice'.³ He goes on to observe, with more justice, that Daniel prayed three times a day (Dan. vi. 10). Can we maintain that these prayers were said at the third, sixth, and ninth hours? Surely not. For we know that the morning and evening sacrifices were still offered at dawn and at sunset in his time,⁴ and these hours would certainly account for two of his daily prayers. The third prayer may have been at noon, though we are not told that it was, and was probably purely private custom, for we have no other reference to a regular daily prayer either at noon or in the afternoon at that period.⁵ Moreover, the form, or content, of the prayers which were recited three times daily in the developed Jewish liturgy was not the same at each of the three services. If these prayers formed the background of the Christian prayers we should expect to find this difference reflected in them also. But from the beginning the same programme of

¹ Loc. cit.

² This is actually given as the reason for *Sext* in Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxvi. 4 (Dix, p. 63).

³ *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300.

⁴ In Dan. ix. 21 the daily whole-offering is still spoken of as עַלְבָתֶן 'the evening oblation' (cf. Ezra ix. 4, 5). The O.T. nowhere gives any hint of the change which took place later.

⁵ In spite of Tertullian's phrase *utique ex Israëlis disciplina* (*De Orat.* xxv).

Psalms and the Lord's Prayer seems to have been followed at each of the three hours.¹ Thus it appears unlikely that the Christian Hours of *Terce*, *Sext*, and *None* were based on any corresponding times of prayer in Judaism.

How, then, did they arise? and why were these hours of the day selected at all? The variety of reasons given in the literature of the late second and early third centuries suggests that the custom was not then of long standing. Thus the *Apostolic Tradition* urges prayer at home or wherever a man happens to be at the third hour, 'for in this hour Christ was seen nailed upon the tree'; at the sixth hour, 'for at that hour when Christ had been hanged upon the wood, the daylight was divided and it became darkness'; and at the ninth hour, 'for in that hour Christ was pierced in His side'.² Cyprian suggests that every three hours the perfect Trinity is numbered, so that the Hours are 'as it were for a sacrament of the Trinity'.³ Like Tertullian and Origen, he also adduces the example of the Apostles, which is based, as we have seen, on a misinterpretation of *Acts*.⁴ Tertullian has yet another reason why we ought to pray at these three times during the day, viz. 'being debtors to the three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit'.⁵ But he seems to give the real reason underlying the choice of these hours, in the same passage—and it is noteworthy that this is the first of the many theories which he there sets forth—when he calls them 'these common hours that mark the intervals of the day'.⁶ He speaks of them as being *insigniores in rebus humanis, quae diem distribuunt, quae negotia distinguunt, quae publice resonant*.⁷ It was just these three hours of the day which were

¹ Cf. Hotham in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, vol. ii, p. 1445.

² Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxvi. 2–6 (Dix, pp. 62–4).

³ *De Orat. Domin.* xxxiv; P.L. iv. 559.

⁴ Ibid. Cf. Tert. *De Orat.* xxv: *De Jejun.* x; P.L. ii. 1017: and, for the sixth hour, Origen, *De Orat.* xii; P.G. xi. 452.

⁵ *De Orat.* xxv; P.L. i. 1300.

⁶ Ibid.: *istarum dico communium, quae diei interspatia signant.*

⁷ *De Jejun.* x; P.L. ii. 1017.

called out publicly in the Roman world.¹ So, in the parable of the Labourers and the Vineyard, the householder went into the market-place to engage fresh labour at the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours.² These hours formed the normal divisions of the Roman day. And if special times were to be allocated to prayer it was natural to fix upon them, hallowed as they were for the Christian by the events connected with the Crucifixion.

Already in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus we find these three Hours set alongside the morning and evening offices as part of the daily programme of Christian prayer.³ Whether they were transmitted by the Apostolic Church to the succeeding ages,⁴ or whether they arose in the Church of the early second century, is impossible to decide from the documents which we possess. It is clear that they were widely observed at the beginning of the third century. Tertullian, like Hippolytus, prescribes prayer five times during the day.⁵ Cyprian seems to emphasize the newer Hours rather than the older offices said in the morning and evening, but he too has the five stated times of prayer.⁶ Clement of Alexandria mentions *Terce*, *Sext*, and *None*.⁷ The Alexandrian Gnostic conception of the whole of life as one long prayer, which appears in Clement, has left its influence on the writings of Origen. Yet he, too, insists that 'that which is customarily called Prayer ought to be performed not less than three times each day'.⁸ We have already seen, in an earlier chapter,

¹ Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* vi. 89 (ed. Kent in the Loeb Series, p. 256).

² Mt. xx. 3, 5. The eleventh hour is introduced into the story simply as the last hour of the day: its point is explained in the sequel.

³ Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxvi (Dix, pp. 62–5).

⁴ So Scudamore in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, vol. i, p. 794.

⁵ See the passage already quoted above, pp. 46–7, 60.

⁶ *De Orat. Dom.* xxxiv, xxxv; P.L. iv. 559, 560.

⁷ *Strom.* vii. vii; P.G. ix. 456. The technical terms are, of course, of later origin.

⁸ *De Orat.* xii; P.G. xi. 452: ἡς εὐχῆς μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ συνήθως ὀνομαζομένη εὐχὴ οὐκ ἔλαττον τοῦ τριῶν ἑκάστης ἡμέρας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ὀφελουσα· —reading

how he insists on daily worship in the morning and evening. Here he defines one of the 'three times each day' as the sixth hour: it is probable that the other two which he had in mind were the third and the ninth. These hours were also, no doubt, intended by the author of the *Didache* when he ordered the Lord's Prayer to be recited three times daily.¹ The absence of any reference in this passage to the morning and evening offices is to be explained by the fact that the *Pater Noster* formed no part of those offices.²

Thus the influence of the virgins and ascetics was already plainly felt. The prayers at *Terce*, *Sext*, and *None*, once added to the older morning and evening offices, quickly became established in the regular cycle of prayer. The leaders of the Church in North Africa are heard recommending them to the faithful, at the beginning of the third century. In Egypt we find Origen urging that not even the season of night can be rightly passed without prayer to God: the Christian believer should follow the example of Paul and Silas, who prayed and sang hymns at midnight in the prison at Philippi (Acts xvi. 25), and the Psalmist who rose at midnight to give thanks to God for His righteous judgements (Ps. cxix. 62).³ At Rome the hour of cock-crow was added to those mentioned above.⁴ Thus, at the beginning of the third century, the ascetic movement within the Church had evolved already a rota of prayer

διηλονοσα with the *Griech. Christ. Schrift.* (Leipzig 1899) rather than the διηλονος of Migne.

¹ viii. 3; ed. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (London 1891), p. 221.

² When the daily Eucharist was instituted the Lord's Prayer would be said by the *fideles*, but it formed no part of the Pro-Anaphora. It was inserted after the Consecration and before the Invitation to communicate, according to Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Mystagog.* v. xi; P.G. xxxiii. 1117. Its use at the Eucharist is attested also by Chrysostom, *In Epist. ad Ephes. Cap. iv Hom. xiv. 4*; P.G. lxii. 105. The use was not general, however, before the first quarter of the fifth century. The catechumens did not say the Lord's Prayer since they did not remain for the celebration of the Eucharist: Chrysostom, *In Epist. II ad Corinth. Hom. ii. 5*; P.G. lxi. 399.

³ Origen, *De Orat.* xii; P.G. xi. 452. Cf. *Acts of Philip* ix. 102 (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 447).

⁴ Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxvi. 8, 14 (Dix, pp. 65, 67).

at dawn, *Terce*, *Sext*, *None*, the lamp-lighting, midnight, and cock-crow.

In the fourth century there appeared a desire to conform the rule of prayer to the standard which was supposed to be set up in the 119th Psalm: 'Seven times a day do I praise thee'. To accomplish this object Basil tried the expedient of dividing the midday prayer so that part was said before and part after taking food.¹ But this arrangement was not generally accepted. In the list of Hours by Jerome in his letter to the virgin Eustochium we find the old arrangement given: 'Prayers, as everyone knows, ought to be said at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, at dawn and at evening'.² At these hours and at midnight the psalms were recited.³ 'On the Lord's day only they proceeded to the church';⁴ the monastic development was complete. Towards the end of the fourth century the monks of Bethlehem added one more office to the daily course. John Cassian witnessed its introduction there about A.D. 382. Before that time the monks had been accustomed to take some sleep when the offices of the early morning were ended, and to rise again at the third hour for *Terce*.⁵ At Bethlehem it was decided to put an end to this laxity by the introduction of an office at the first hour, consisting of three psalms and thus similar to the offices at the other three hours of prayer during the day.⁶ This was the origin of *Prime*.

The last of the offices to be added to the daily cycle was *Compline*. 'When the night begins', writes Basil, 'we ask that our rest may be offenceless . . . hence we say the 90th psalm'.⁷ In the West it was mentioned, under the name

¹ *Serm. Ascetic.* i. iv; P.G. xxxi. 877.

² *Ep.* xxii. 37; P.L. xxii. 421.

³ *Ep.* cxxx. 15; P.L. xxii. 1119; *Ep.* cvii. 9; P.L. xxii. 875.

⁴ *Ep.* cviii. 20; P.L. xxii. 896.

⁵ Basil, *Reg. Fus. Tract.* xxxvii. 3; P.G. xxxi. 1013; Chrysostom, *In Epist. I ad Timoth.* Cap. v Hom. xiv. 4; P.G. lxii. 576. .

⁶ Cassian, *De Coenob. Instit.* iii. 4; P.L. xl ix. 127-30.

⁷ *Reg. Fus. Tract.* xxxvii. 5; P.G. xxxi. 1015.

completorium which it has retained, by Cassiodorus.¹ But it is probable that Benedict was the first to give it a place in the regular cycle of the daily offices.²

The story of the Hours is finished. The old morning and evening services, rightly recognized by Batiffol as the legacy of the Synagogue,³ were later supplemented by the offices evolved under the influence of asceticism. These offices, consisting of psalmody, and prayers built up on the model of the Lord's Prayer—which must always precede all other petitions⁴—doubtless influenced the form of *Lauds* and *Vespers* when once *they* were incorporated in the monastic rule. We have seen that the other Canonical Hours have no connexion with the liturgy of the Synagogue, in regard to the times at which they were recited. In that they consisted of psalms and prayers there is a partial resemblance in form: but the essential features of the Synagogue service, viz. the reading of Scripture and the exposition of it, were absent. For the Hours were the product of a process of withdrawal from the world: they were the perquisite of the few. The Synagogue arose out of the need to bring religion to the masses. Its liturgy was moulded by the needs of congregational worship. Thus we shall find that the Church retained in the Pro-Anaphora of the Eucharist those congregational elements in its liturgy which proved useful vehicles of lay instruction and worship, though they disappeared from the offices of the ascetic groups whose whole life was devoted to meditation and study.

¹ *Expos. in Psalm. on Ps. cxviii. 164; P.L. lxx. 895.*

² Cf. Batiffol, op. cit., p. 28; *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, s.v. 'Hours of Prayer', p. 796.

³ Op. cit., pp. 3-4.

⁴ Ambrosiaster, *De Sacr.* vi. v. 22; P.L. xvi. 479; Augustine, *Sermo* lvi. iii (§ 4); P.L. xxxviii. 379: *In Psalm. ciii Sermo* i. 19; P.L. xxxvi. 1352.

CHAPTER V

THE PRO-ANARHORA: THE EARLY OUTLINE

THE reading and exposition of Scripture were among the pre-Christian elements of the liturgy of the Synagogue which were taken over by the Jewish and Gentile Christians. In Acts xvii. 11 reference is made to the synagogue of the Jews of Beroea who examined the Scriptures daily 'whether these things were so'. This suggests that in the synagogues of the Dispersion access could be had to the rolls of Scripture (Greek) at any time, just as, presumably, was the case in the synagogues of Palestine.¹ On the other hand, there is a definite reference to public worship in 'Till I come give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching'.² The New Testament also has numerous references to prayer in common,³ and to 'psalms and hymns and spiritual songs'.⁴ All these were elements in the Sabbath morning service of the Synagogue, and had their place in the service on festivals as well as on Mondays and Thursdays. On ordinary days there were no lections, as we have seen in the chapter on the Jewish liturgy.

In the literature of the sub-Apostolic age the same features appear. Nowhere in Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, or the *Epistle of Barnabas* is there any direct evidence of Scripture-reading being part of public worship. On the other hand, all these writers appear to take it for granted that the Old Testament Scriptures are familiar to their hearers. Clement of Rome refers to the story of Cain and Abel in the LXX version, which he quotes for Gen. iv. 3-8,⁵ as in his citations of Is. liii⁶ and Ps. i, 16-23.⁷ Polycarp speaks of the sacred Scriptures, in which he

¹ Oesterley, *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford 1925), p. 113. ² 1 Tim. iv. 13.

³ e.g. Acts xii. 5, 12, xiii. 3, xiv. 23, xx. 36; 1 Cor. xi. 4, xiv. 13; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1. ⁴ Col. iii. 16; cf. Eph. v. 19.

⁵ 1 Clem. iv (Lightfoot, Part I, vol. ii, p. 22; P.G. i. 216).

⁶ 1 Clem. xvi (Lightfoot, ibid., p. 58 et seq.; P.G. i. 240-1).

⁷ 1 Clem. xxxv (Lightfoot, ibid., p. 109; P.G. i. 280).

hopes his hearers are well versed, and quotes Ps. iv. 4 from the LXX version.¹ There can be no doubt that the reading and explanation of the Scriptures during public worship in the Synagogue were the chief means whereby the knowledge of them was disseminated among the Jewish-Christians. The same method of making them familiar to the Gentile Christians is seen at work in the Ecclesia within a generation of the final break with Judaism. Justin Martyr gives definite evidence of the reading of Scripture, followed by a homily upon it, in the Sunday morning Pro-Anaphora both in town and country.²

It is probable that the Gospels also were beginning to be regarded as Scripture at about this time.³ A lesson from the Gospels may have been included in the 'memoirs of the Apostles' which, with the 'writings of the prophets', were read as long as time permitted.⁴ By the end of the second century four Canonical Gospels were accepted among the Catholics,⁵ while Marcion rejected the entire Gospel, the Montanists did not admit the Fourth Gospel or the Epistles of Paul, and the Valentinians were said to 'possess more gospels than there are'.⁶ The Ebionites used the Gospel of Matthew only.⁷ Thus there was considerable

¹ *Ad Philip.* xii. 1 (Lightfoot, Part II, vol. ii, p. 928). The Jews reject the interpretation of the LXX, from which, moreover, they have taken away some passages, according to Justin, *Dialog. c. Tryph.* lxxi-lxxiii; P.G. vi. 616-21. For the Jewish custom of reading the Scriptures in Synagogue cf. b.Ber. 8a (foot)-8b (top): 'Rab Huna b. Judah stated that R. Menahem said in the name of R. Ammi: A man should always complete his *Pārāshiyōt* with the congregation, twice the Hebrew and once the *Targūm*—even 'Ataroth and Dibon' (Num. xxxii. 3) [which have no *Targūm*—Rashi, *ad loc.*], for whoever completes his *Pārāshiyōt* with the congregation, his days are prolonged for ever.'

² Justin, *Apol.* i. lxvii; P.G. vi. 429.

³ For the superiority of the Gospel to the Law see already Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* ix; P.G. v. 836. In his *Ad Smyrn.* (vii; P.G. v. 849) he tells his hearers *προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἔξαρτετως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*: but there is no mention, in either of these passages, of any public reading of the Gospels.

⁴ Justin, *Apol.* i. lxvii; P.G. vi. 429.

⁵ Iren., *Adv. Haer.* III. xi. 8; P.G. vii. 885.

⁶ Ibid. III. xi. 9; P.G. vii. 890. Actually Marcion retained the Gospel of St. Luke, but in a mutilated form (cf. Tertullian).

⁷ Ibid. i. xxvi. 2; P.G. vii. 687.

diversity of opinion with regard to the Gospels, but even the Severians, a branch of the Encratites, used ‘the Law, and Prophets, and Gospels’ interpreting them in their own way,¹ while Catholic Christians ‘in every succession and in every city held that which was preached by the Law and the Prophets and the Lord’.² Irenaeus made a spirited defence of *Tōrah* against the treatment it received at the hands of the Valentinians, who selected what suited their mystic system of numbers and rejected the rest.³ In another passage he speaks of the Prophets and the Gospels as the entire Scriptures, which ‘can be clearly, unambiguously and harmoniously understood by all’.⁴ This argues a familiarity with their contents such as could only have been obtained through hearing them read and expounded publicly. It is evident from Justin Martyr’s remark (*μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ*) that in Christian as well as in Jewish worship, whatever passages were read, the choice was left to the reader, and their length also was left to him, at least in the early period.⁵ The Reader was in all probability not yet an official. The Old Testament was everywhere regarded as divinely authoritative, and the Canon of New Testament books was evolved through the need of what was described as ‘lawful and diligent exposition in harmony with the Scriptures’ (i.e. the Old Testament Scriptures).⁶ The need of preaching moulded the Lectionary, which in turn helped to determine the Canon.⁷

¹ Euseb., *H.E.* iv. xxix. 5; P.G. xx. 401 (top).

² Hegesippus in his *Memoirs* (*ὑπομνήματα*), quoted Euseb., *H.E.* iv. xxii. 3; P.G. xx. 377 (foot).

³ Iren., *Adv. Haer.* ii. xxiv. 3; P.G. vii. 791.

⁴ Ibid. ii. xxvii. 2; P.G. vii. 803.

⁵ Cf. Oesterley, op. cit., p. 117. For the Canon of O.T. see S. Zeitlin, *An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Jew. Publ. Soc. of America, 1933). For the Synagogue lections see Büchler in *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. v, pp. 420 et seq.; Elbogen, op. cit., pp. 155–86; and the articles in *J.E.*, vol. vii, p. 647; vol. xii, p. 254.

⁶ Iren., *Adv. Haer.* iv. xxiii. 8; P.G. vii. 1077.

⁷ Cf. Chase, ‘The Lord’s Prayer in the Early Church’ (in *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. iii), Cambridge 1891, p. 8.

Moreover, the custom of expounding the portion of Scripture just read, which we find in the Church from the very beginning, was directly derived from the practice of the Synagogue. Of these early *Midrashim* a few are still extant. The so-called Second Epistle of Clement has been described as the oldest extant homily.¹ In effect the commentaries of Hippolytus are *Midrashim*, especially the commentary *On Proverbs*.² The queer legend of Ialdabaoth contains much Rabbinic exegesis which has been Christianized.³ And other examples could be cited.

In the literature of the period down to Irenaeus the references to prayer and psalmody are not numerous. The First Epistle of Clement of Rome contains a passage which seems to embody the kind of extempore prayer which was offered at that time. Its phrases are frequently reminiscent of the language of the Synagogue: the ideas expressed are often the same. Compare, for example, the clause:

"Thou who abasest the insolence of the proud, who scatterest the machinations of the people, who exaltest the humble and puttest down the mighty; Thou who givest riches and poverty, death and life, sole Benefactor of spirits, God of all flesh . . ."⁴

with the second Benediction of the Palestinian '*Amidāh*'.⁵ The petitions for help and succour from God, for the healing of the sick, for forgiveness, for peace, all find their place in this prayer and in the Palestinian '*Amidāh*' alike. The very phrases 'Creator of all things' בָּרוּא אֶת־ (אָתֶה),⁶ 'King of the Ages' מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם (הַכָּלְלָה),⁷ recall the language of the Synagogue.⁸

¹ McGiffert in his edition of Eusebius (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*), p. 169 n. 4.

² For the text see N. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke*, i (in *Griech. Christ. Schrift.*).

³ Cf. Iren., *Adv. Haer.* i. xxx. 5–10; P.G. vii. 697–700.

⁴ Cf. Clem. lxx (Lightfoot, Part I, vol. ii, pp. 172 et seq.).

⁵ See the table on pp. 114–15.

⁶ Cf. the early morning Benediction *Yōzēr* (Singer, op. cit., p. 36).

⁷ Frequently in the Synagogue prayers.

⁸ The *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, xiv (Lightfoot, Part II, vol. ii, p. 972) contains a prayer which includes the phrase ὁ ἀψευδῆς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.

But it would be rash to expect whole passages in the early Christian prayers to be word for word parallel with those of the Synagogue liturgy. That liturgy was being modified and expanded during the period in which the Church arose. It would be unjustifiable, therefore, to expect to find the prayers of the *developed* Synagogue liturgy adapted to the needs of the early Church. Christian scholars have been guilty of an error of judgement when they have printed in parallel columns prayers taken from the modern Jewish prayer books and passages from Clement or other early Christian writings. Cabrol tried to show the verbal similarities between Jewish and Christian prayers by displaying in parallel columns phrases taken from the modern '*Amīdāh* (*Shemōneh 'Esreh*), and verses of the Magnificat, Benedictus, or Nunc Dimittis, or extracts from the writings of Clement.¹ A more detailed comparison of the '*Amīdāh* with Clement and the *Didache*, and of the '*Ahabāh* prayer with a prayer in the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*, was made by Oesterley.² But their work must be accepted with the greatest caution. Undoubtedly there are similar ideas and even parallel phrases in the Jewish and Christian prayers. But it has been shown above, in our discussion of the '*Amīdāh*, that, while some of the Benedictions are certainly pre-Christian, others were added to the prayer during the period A.D. 10–40, and yet others are of still later origin. Now the date of the composition of our Gospel of Luke is probably A.D. 80–85,³ and whatever theory of Proto-Luke we may hold, it is generally agreed that the Magnificat and Benedictus are very loosely appended to the narrative of Luke i and that they are

Cf. the Synagogue prayer beginning אמת ויציב (Singer, op. cit., p. 42) which, though not composed before A.D. 150–200, probably contains old material.

¹ F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica* (Paris 1900–1902), vol. i, pp. xvii.

² Op. cit., pp. 127 et seq.

³ Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London 1924), p. 540; J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London 1930), p. xxiii.

Jewish or Jewish-Christian hymns which have been incorporated from some older source.¹ There is a similarity in thought between Lk. i. 51 and the second Benediction of the Palestinian '*Amīdāh*', but the parallel in language is not so compelling as that which we have noted between this Benediction and *1 Clem.* lix. Cabrol equates Lk. i. 51 with the twelfth Benediction of the '*Amīdāh*', which was certainly not commonly used in the Synagogue, if at all, before A.D. 90. His alleged parallel between Lk. i. 54 and the first Benediction is simply non-existent, and this can be said of other verses in his table. Indeed the relative dates of the Magnificat or Benedictus and most of the '*Amīdāh*' preclude the possibility of any conscious direct borrowing in the former from the latter. It may be that the pre-Christian Benedictions of the '*Amīdāh*' (e.g. Benedictions 1 and 2), familiar to the composer of the Christian canticles from childhood, were incorporated by him almost inevitably in these new hymns of praise to God. It is equally possible that the Christian canticles and the Jewish prayer were natural expressions of minds steeped in the language of Old Testament Scripture, which developed independently along parallel lines of their own.

Moreover, any discussion of parallels between the language of the Jewish and Christian prayers must take into account the old Palestinian Synagogue service. It is useless to take the modern ritual of the Ashkenazim, which is printed in Singer's Daily Prayer Book, and then to look for parallels in Clement or the *Didache*. Oesterley's first example will demonstrate this point.² He cites *1 Clem.* lix. 3:

‘(Grant us) to hope in Thy Name, the first source of all Creation; open the eyes of our heart to know Thee, that Thou alone art the Highest among the highest, and remainest Holy among the holy ones.’

With this prayer Oesterley compares the modern version

¹ Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 306.

² Oesterley, op. cit., p. 127.

of Benediction 3 of the '*Amīdāh*',¹ to which it bears a vague resemblance. 'The central thoughts', he says, 'in each of these passages, which are clearly parallel, are the holiness of God, and the praise accorded to Him by the highest, i.e. the holy ones, by which are meant, of course, the angels.'² Unfortunately for Oesterley the Old Palestinian version, which was not composed, moreover, till the period A.D. 10–40, does not contain the crucial phrase 'and holy ones praise Thee every day'. We are left with the attribution of holiness to God as the sole parallel between the two prayers, and this does not need any theory of direct connexion, or borrowing, to explain it. Similar difficulties will be found with many of the other passages cited by Oesterley, if they be compared with the shorter Palestinian version of the '*Amīdāh*'. The '*Ahabāh*' prayer, which Oesterley compares with a prayer from the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*,³ was probably not known before the end of the second century A.D.⁴ It is unlikely that any conscious borrowing of prayers from the Synagogue took place at so late a date. It is possible, however, that the prayer from the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*:

' . . . Grant us knowledge and faith and piety and sanctification. . . . Grant that we may seek Thee and love Thee. Grant that we may search Thy divine words and study them . . .'⁵

may reflect an early Christian prayer modelled on the Palestinian version of the fourth Benediction of the '*Amīdāh*', which was added to the Synagogue liturgy c. A.D. 10–40:

'O favour us, Our Father, with knowledge from Thyself, and understanding and discernment from Thy *Tōrāh*. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who vouchsafest knowledge.'⁶

¹ This and the Palestinian version are given, with translations, in the table on p. 115.

² Op. cit., p. 128.

³ Op. cit., p. 130.

⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 21.

⁵ Cited by Oesterley, op. cit., p. 130.

⁶ For the Hebrew, see the table on p. 116.

Enough has been said to show the danger of pressing verbal parallels too far. The language of Synagogue prayer undoubtedly influenced its counterpart in the Church, but both in the Synagogue and in the Church the first century was a time of experiment, and the language of prayer must have been much less rigid than it afterwards became.

When we turn from the language to the subjects of prayer, the influence of the Synagogue can be seen more clearly. Christians prayed for 'faith, fear, peace, forbearance, self-control, purity, and temperance' in words which, with the exception of the closing petition 'through Jesus Christ our Lord',¹ the Rabbis would have whole-heartedly endorsed.² Polycarp enjoined Christians to 'pray for all the saints. Pray also for kings, and potentates and princes, and for those that persecute and hate you, and for the enemies of the Cross'.³ All these, except, of course, the last named, were objects of prayer among the adherents of the Synagogue. Prayer for the saints was included in the second Benediction of the daily '*Amidāh*'.⁴ It seems likely that this Benediction, which dates from the first century B.C., was in St. Paul's mind when he wrote to the Corinthians on the subject of the Resurrection. 'We shall not all sleep', he said, 'but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and we shall be raised etc.'⁵ The Palestinian version of the second Benediction contains the phrase, absent from the Babylonian '*Amidāh*: 'Thou art mighty . . . that sustaintest the living, that quickenest the dead; in the twinkling of an eye Thou makest salvation to spring forth for us.' The phrase 'in the twinkling of an eye' (*כָהֲרֵף עַיִן*) may well have sprung to St. Paul's mind, almost involuntarily, when

¹ *i* Clem. lxiv (ed Lightfoot, op. cit., Part I, vol. ii, pp. 186–7).

² Cf. the extracts given in Montefiore and Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (London 1938), pp. 361–70.

³ Polycarp, *Ad Philip.* xii. 3 (Lightfoot, Part II, vol. ii, p. 930; P.G. v. 1015).

⁴ See the table on p. 114.

⁵ *i* Cor. xv. 51, 52.

speaking of the Resurrection, because it had been recited by him in his prayers every day since his boyhood. It is incredible that this is the only instance in which the Synagogue prayers influenced the thought and the prayers of Christians.

Prayer for kings and rulers, which Polycarp urged Christians to offer, was also an established Jewish practice. Sacrifices for foreign rulers were an immemorial custom,¹ and were doubtless accompanied by prayers for their welfare.² The stopping of the offering for the emperor in A.D. 66 was, as Josephus observes, equivalent to a declaration of war.³

The teaching of the Rabbis was that a man is in duty bound to utter a Benediction for the bad, even as he utters one for the good.⁴ R. Pedat's prayer is on record:

'May it be Thy will, O Lord my God and God of my fathers, that no hatred against any man come into our hearts, and no hatred against us come into the heart of any man, and may none be jealous of us, and may we not be jealous of any; and may *Tôrâh* be our labour all the days of our lives, and may our words be as supplications before Thee.'⁵

This prayer for all that persecute and hate one another is in striking contrast to the malediction against heretics and apostates which was introduced into the '*Amidâh*' about A.D. 90, and was chiefly directed against Christians, as the Palestinian version shows.⁶ Prayer without ceasing on behalf of all non-Christians was recommended by Ignatius,⁷ and Justin told Trypho that the Jews found a special place in the prayers of the Christians, 'for Christ taught us

¹ *Vide* 1 Macc. vii. 33; Philo, *Legat. ad Gaium*, xxiii. 152; xlvi. 355-7.

² b.Yom. 69a; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II. x. 4. These references are cited in G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, vol. ii, p. 115. ³ Moore, loc. cit.

⁴ Ber. ix. 5.

⁵ j.Ber. iv. 2, fol. 7d.

⁶ See the table on pp. 119-20 where the Hebrew text of the Twelfth Benediction is given. There can be little doubt that **נָגְנִים** here means 'Christians'. Their importance is specifically recognized by the fact that they are not included in the *Minim*, presumably heretical Gnostic sects within Judaism in this instance, who are also anathematized in the Benediction. They were *Jewish-Christians*. ⁷ *Ad Ephes.* x. 1; P.G. v. 744.

to pray also for our enemies, saying "Love your enemies".¹

It was the custom among Christians from the beginning, as among the Jews, to pray standing,² with the hands raised and slightly extended towards heaven.³ Frescoes, sarcophagi, sepulchral monuments, ancient glass, mosaics in the earliest basilicas, above all the Roman catacombs, exhibit the faithful praying in this attitude.⁴ We shall see that succeeding generations followed the custom of their forefathers.

In the New Testament there are three references to the liturgical use of psalms. 'When ye come together, each hath a psalm . . .' (1 Cor. xiv. 26), 'speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs' (Eph. v. 19), 'teaching and admonishing one another with psalms, and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God' (Col. iii. 16)—these exhortations are sufficient evidence of the liturgical use of psalms from the beginning. And although there are no explicit references to the subject in the literature of the sub-Apostolic age, the frequent quotations from the psalms in the writings of this period show great familiarity with them, which was doubtless due, in part, to the recitation and singing of them in public worship.⁵ From what is said on the subject in slightly later sources it is evident that psalms had always been used in Christian worship, and that, therefore, the Jewish liturgical use of them had been continued uninterruptedly by the Christian Church.⁶ The custom arose

¹ *Dialog. c. Tryph.* xcvi; P.G. vi. 704. Cf. *ibid.* cviii; P.G. vi. 728.

² Phil. i. 27; Eph. vi. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8.

³ 1 Clem. ii (Lightfoot, Part I, vol. ii, p. 17; P.G. i. 209), xxix (*ibid.*, p. 93; P.G. i. 269). ⁴ *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, p. 1684, s.v. 'Prayer'.

⁵ Oesterley, op. cit., p. 148. Cf. the references to the Hallelujah, &c., in Hippolytus' Syriac Introd. to the Psalms (German tr. in Bonwetsch and Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke*, I. ii. 127–130), and the spurious Greek Introd. (*ibid.*, p. 139, line 4 et seq.).

⁶ Tertullian mentions the chanting of psalms as an integral part of the service of the Lord's Day, in *De Anima*, ix; P.L. ii. 701: *Prout Scripturae leguntur aut psalmi canuntur aut allocutiones proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur.*

of intercalating refrains in the course of the psalm, to be taken up by the whole congregation after each verse or pair of verses.¹ This manner of treating the psalmody is attested by Tertullian as an existing custom, about A.D. 200.² The Christians no doubt had adopted it from the Jews.³

In fact, the four essential elements of the Pro-Anaphora, lections from Holy Scripture, homilies, prayers, and the singing of psalms, were all adopted from the Jewish Synagogue worship. They are explicitly mentioned, or are implied, in the literature of the sub-Apostolic age. When we come to the writings of the late second, and early third centuries, we find the same elements persisting.

Here is a description of Christian worship in the time of Tertullian:

'We are a society (*corpus*) with a common religious feeling, unity of discipline, a common bond of hope. We meet in gathering and congregation (*in coetum et congregationem*) to approach God in prayer, massing our forces to surround him. This violence that we do to Him is pleasing unto God. We pray also for emperors, for their ministers and those in authority, for the security of the world, for peace on earth, for postponement of the end. We come together to call the sacred writings to remembrance . . . and no less we reinforce our teaching by inculcation of God's precepts. There are, besides, exhortations in our gatherings, rebukes, godly censure. For judgement is passed and it carries great weight, as it must among men certain that God sees them; and it is a notable foretaste of judgement to come, if any man has so sinned as to be banished from all share in our prayer, our assembly, and all holy intercourse.'⁴

All the features of the Christian service which we have noted above are mentioned here, with the exception of

¹ See the example quoted from Bruce's Gnostic Papyrus in Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary* (Eng. tr. London 1912), p. 4.

² *De Orat.* xxvii; P.L. i. 1194: *Diligentiores in orando subjungere in orationibus Alleluia solent et hoc genus psalmos quorum clausulis respondeant qui simul sunt.*

³ Philo, speaking of the *Therapeuti*, is quoted by Eus., *H.E.* II. xvii. 22; P.G. xx. 184: 'Ἐνδει μετὰ ῥυθμοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος, οἱ λοιποὶ καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἀκρούωνται τῶν ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκροτελεύτα συνεξῆχονται.'

⁴ *Apol.* xxxix; P.L. i. 532.

82 THE PRO-ANAPHORA: THE EARLY OUTLINE

psalmody.¹ It is noteworthy that the prayer for emperors and those in authority is specially mentioned.² In another passage Tertullian tells his readers: 'we pray for them long life, a secure rule, a safe home, brave armies, a faithful senate, an honest people, a quiet world, and everything for which a man and a Caesar can pray.'³ The ritual of prayer was ordained by God, who through His Son gave men a pattern of prayer.⁴ But it is right for Christians 'after dispatching first the regular and standard prayer by way of a foundation, to build on it outside petitions embodying their desires, always remembering however the prescribed requests'.⁵

'As regards kneeling, also,' says Tertullian,⁶ 'prayer finds a variety of practice in the action of a certain very few who refrain from kneeling on the Saturday (*sabbato*). . . . But we, according to the tradition we have received, on the day of the Lord's resurrection, and on it alone, ought to refrain carefully not only from this, but from every attitude and duty that causes perplexity. The same thing too at Whitsuntide, which is marked by the same solemnity of its rejoicing. But who would hesitate daily to prostrate himself before God at the very first prayer with which we enter on the day? Further at the fastings and stations no prayer is to be engaged in without the bended knee, for we are not only praying but also begging for mercy and confessing our misdeeds to God our Lord.'

Apparently by c. A.D. 200 the older custom of standing for prayer had already gone out of use, except on Sundays and festivals. It may be that the habit of kneeling for prayer originated on fast days and station days, as a gesture of

¹ That omission is compensated by the reference, which has been noted above, in *De Orat.* xxvii; P.L. i. 1194.

² Cf. Polycarp, cited above, p. 78.

³ *Apol.* xxx; P.L. i. 504. Cf. Arnobius, *Adv. Gent.* iv. xxxvi; P.L. v. 1076 (Migne, loc. cit., compares Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Mystagog.* v).

⁴ Tertullian, *De Orat.* ix; P.L. i. 1165: *ab ipso, igitur, ordinata religio orationis.*

⁵ *Ibid.* x; P.L. i. 1165: *praemissa legitima et ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento, accendentium ius est desideriorum superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones, cum memoria tamen praeceptorum.*

⁶ *Ibid.* xxiii; P.L. i. 1191.

penitence, and then spread to ordinary weekdays as well.¹ In another passage Tertullian says: 'On the Lord's Day we account a fast or worshipping (*adorare*) on the knees unlawful. We enjoy the same freedom also from Easter Day to Pentecost.'²

The Christian still prayed, according to the old custom, with hands outspread and head uncovered.³ It was usual, also, to turn to the East when praying.⁴

References to the reading of Scripture and singing of psalms are common in the literature of the North African Church of this period.⁵ There is evidence of catechetical instruction being given c. A.D. 200⁶; and it is clear that the distinction between Pro-Anaphora and Anaphora was carefully observed among the Catholics, catechumens being permitted to attend only the former.⁷ It was not so among some of the heretical sects.⁸ The Reader (*lector*) had now achieved the status of an official in the Church.⁹ In order that he might read 'the precepts and the Gospel of the Lord', the Reader went up to the reading-desk (*pulpitum*), which Cyprian describes as 'the tribunal of the church'.¹⁰ The older word for this raised platform was *ambo*.¹¹ It was situated in the centre of the church, like the reading-desk

¹ The soldiers of the so-called Melitene legion of Marcus Aurelius' army, on the eve of joining battle with the Germans, 'kneeled on the ground as is our custom in prayer and engaged in supplications to God': Eus., *H.E.* v. v. 1; P.G. xx. 441.

² *De Corona* iii; P.L. ii. 99.

³ Tert., *Apol.* xxx; P.L. i. 503. Cf. Tert., *De Orat.* xiv; P.L. i. 1169: *nos vero non attollimus tantum, sed etiam expandimus, et dominicam passionem modulantes et orantes confitemur Christo.* Cf. *ibid.* xvii; P.L. i. 1174: *De Baptism.* xx (*ad fin.*); P.L. i. 1224.

⁴ Tert., *Ad Nation.* i. xiii; P.L. i. 650: *Apol.* xvi; P.L. i. 426: Origen, *Hom. in Num.* v. 1; P.G. xii. 603.

⁵ e.g. Tert., *De Anima*, ix; P.L. ii. 701: *De Exhort. Castit.* x; P.L. ii. 974.

⁶ Tert., *De Praescrip.* xli, § 4 (De Labriolle, in *Textes et Documents* (Paris 1906), p. 90); P.L. ii. 68.

⁷ *Ibid.* xli, § 2 (De Labriolle, p. 88); P.L. ii. 68.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.* xli, § 8 (De Labriolle, p. 90); P.L. ii. 69. Bindley, in the S.P.C.K. ed. p. 92 n. 2, notes that this is the earliest mention of an order of Readers.

¹⁰ Cyprian, *Ep.* xxxiv. 4; P.L. iv. 331.

¹¹ Migne, op. cit., iv. 327 n. 81.

84 THE PRO-ANAPHORA: THE EARLY OUTLINE

in a synagogue.¹ From this vantage point the *Lector* read passages from the Old Testament, the Gospels, and also the Epistles.² At Rome, apparently, the North African Church had a community of its own. At all events, Cyprian wrote to Rome saying that he had learnt that the few clergy there 'scarcely suffice for the performance of the daily services'.³ He had, therefore, appointed Saturus a Reader, and Optatus the Confessor a sub-deacon.⁴ From a letter of Cornelius, who was elected Bishop of Rome in A.D. 251, to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, we learn that the Roman clergy in his day numbered forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, and fifty-two readers and janitors.⁵ The Readers were held in great esteem.⁶ During the persecution under Diocletian 'the prisons everywhere . . . were filled with bishops, presbyters, and deacons, readers and exorcists, so that room was no longer left in them for those condemned for crimes'.⁷ We can safely infer from all this that the reading of passages from the Scriptures, which was the business of a Reader, was an important part of the service in Rome and North Africa.

The offering up of prayers, the reading of the Scriptures, the preaching of sermons, and the chanting of psalms are mentioned together, as forming the Pro-Anaphora of the Lord's Day, in Tertullian, *De Anima* ix (quoted above). It was customary to add to the prayers at all times the

¹ In modern times the *Almemar* has often been moved forward, close up to the Ark. Cf. *J.E.* vol. i, p. 430; vol. xi, p. 638.

² Tert., *De Praescrip.* xxxvi, § 1 (De Labriolle, op. cit., p. 78); P.L. ii. 58: *Age iam qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis sua, percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident; apud quas ipsae authenticae litterae eorum recitantur, sonantes voces et repraesentantes faciem uniuscuiusque.* For the reading of the Gospel from the pulpitum cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* xxxiii. 2-3; P.L. iv. 327-8.

³ *Ep.* xxiv; P.L. iv. 294.

⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵ Eus., *H.E.* vi. xlivi. 11; P.L. xx. 621.

⁶ *Vos flores in plebe, vos estis Christi lucernae:* Commodianus, *Instruc.* ii. xxvi, line 9; see the Vienna *Corpus Scrip. Eccl. Lat.* vol. xv, p. 97.

⁷ Eus., *H.E.* viii. vi. 9; P.G. xx. 756.

Hallelujah and other psalms said responsively, as we have noted already.¹ Many psalms and hymns were written by the faithful from the beginning, celebrating Christ the Word of God.² It may have been some of these which Cyprian recommended for use at the evening meal.³ Another Latin writer, at the beginning of the fourth century, remarked:

‘There are two things which ought to be offered [in true worship], the gift (*donum*) and the sacrifice. . . . His offering is innocence of soul; His sacrifice praise and a hymn. For we ought to sacrifice to God in word, inasmuch as God is the Word as He Himself confessed. Therefore the chief ceremonial in the worship of God is praise from the mouth of a just man directed towards God.’⁴

When we turn to contemporary Egypt, we find the same form of service in the Pro-Anaphora as that described by Tertullian. Origen mentions prayer and ‘the hearing of the Word’ as necessary preludes to the Eucharist.⁵ But a daily Pro-Anaphora is also indicated. He speaks of the perpetual festival of God, in which prayers ‘are to be offered unceasingly and without any intermission in the morning and evening sacrifices’.⁶ For:

‘The day is a festival of the Lord, if we offer sacrifice to Him⁷ unceasingly, if we pray without intermission, so that our prayer may go up as incense before Him in the morning, and the lifting up of our hands may be for Him an evening sacrifice.’⁸

As in Rome and North Africa, so in Egypt, prayer was made looking towards the East.⁹ This was not only on the Lord’s Day, but also at the daily prayer at sunrise.¹⁰ The

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 80, and pp. 96–9 *infra*.

² Anon., *c. Artemon*. quoted Eus., *H.E.* v. xxviii. 5; P.G. xx. 513.

³ *Ep.* i. 16; P.L. iv. 227.

⁴ Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* vi. xxv; P.L. vi. 729–30.

⁵ *Hom. in Exod.* xi. 7; P.G. xii. 382.

⁶ *Hom. in Num.* xxiii. 3; P.G. xii. 748.

⁷ Reading *ei* with the *Griech. Christ. Schrift.* vii. 214 for the *et* of Migne.

⁸ Origen, *Hom. in Num.* xxiii. 3; P.G. xii. 749.

⁹ Origen, *De Orat.* xxxii; P.G. xi. 556. Cf. *The Assumption of the Virgin*, x (ed. James, *Apoc. N.T.* p. 195) = begin. Sahidic fragment ii (Robinson, p. 70).

¹⁰ Clement, *Strom.* vii. vii; P.G. ix. 461.

86 THE PRO-ANAPHORA: THE EARLY OUTLINE

hands were raised and the arms outstretched, in the form of a Cross.¹ The old Jewish custom of standing for prayer is reflected in two apocryphal writings of the period.²

The Reading of the Law was also of daily occurrence. Commenting on the crossing of the Jordan, Origen says in his allegorical fashion:

‘When you are added to the number of catechumens, and have begun to submit to the precepts of the Church, you have crossed the Red Sea, and situated in desert places you attend daily to the hearing of the Law of God, and to the contemplation of the face of Moses revealed through the glory of the Lord.’³

The mention of catechumens in this passage precludes the possibility that Origen had in mind the Eucharist. We have already noted the passage in another of his sermons which reads: ‘Tell me, you who come together in church only on festal days (*festis diebus*), are not the other days festal (*festi*)? are they not days of the Lord? . . . Christians eat the flesh of the Lamb on every day, that is they daily partake of the flesh of the word of God.’⁴ Reasons have been given for thinking that this last sentence has no connexion with the Eucharist.⁵ Origen was speaking of the daily reading of the Scriptures in public worship, which he considered of equal importance with the Eucharist itself, for he remarks in another homily:

‘I wish to remind you of the nature of your religion. You who are accustomed to come in to the divine mysteries, know in what manner, when you receive the Body of the Lord, you guard (it) with all care and veneration, lest even a very little of it fall to the ground, lest anything of the consecrated gift be lost. For you believe, and rightly believe yourselves answerable for it, if anything

¹ Origen, *Hom. in Exod.* iii. 3; P.G. xii. 316; *De Orat.* xxxi; P.G. xi. 550.

² *Gospel of Bartholomew*, ii. 6 (ed. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 170); *Assumption of the Virgin*, x (ibid., p. 195). The reference to James, the brother of our Lord, who was said to have knelt in the Temple, when praying, ‘till his knees became hard like those of a camel’ (Hegesippus, quoted in Eus., *H.E.* II. xxiii. 6; P.G. xx. 197) seems to reflect Christian practice in the time of Hegesippus (c. A.D. 180). *Vide supra*, pp. 82–3.

³ *Hom. in Yes. Nav.* iv. 1; P.G. xii. 843.

⁴ *Hom. in Gen.* x. 3; P.G. xii. 218.

⁵ *Vide supra*, pp. 48–9.

fall thence through negligence. But if so great care is to be employed, and rightly employed, concerning the preservation of His Body, how do you think that it is a less crime to have neglected the word of God than His Body?"¹

And again, commenting on Num. xxiii. 24, he declares:

"We are said to drink the blood of Christ not only in the Eucharist (*non solum sacramentorum ritu*), but also when we receive his discourses (*sermones*), in which is found life; as also He himself says: "the words that I have spoken are spirit and life" (Jn. vi. 63). He, then, was Himself wounded (Is. liii. 5), whose blood we drink, that is [when] we take to ourselves the words of His teaching (*doctrinae ejus verba*)."²

The reading of Scripture was not confined to the Law and the Gospel. Eusebius tells how astonished he was when he first saw Silvanus, the blind bishop of Gaza,³ standing in the midst of a large congregation and repeating portions of the Scriptures: 'while I heard only his voice [not knowing that he was blind] I thought that, according to the custom in the meetings, he was reading';⁴ and he mentions that Silvanus was able to repeat any portion of the Scriptures, whenever he wished, 'whether in the Law, or the Prophets, or the historical books, or the Gospels, or the writings of the Apostles'.⁵ Other writings, too, were often publicly read in the churches,⁶ and some of them were doubtless still in vogue in local churches in the early third century.

Lections and homilies, then, were considered to be as

¹ *Hom. in Exod.* xiii. 3; P.G. xii. 391.

² *Hom. in Num.* xvi. 9; P.G. xii. 701. ³ Martyred c. A.D. 308.

⁴ Eus., *De Mart. Palest.* xiii. 8; P.G. xx. 1517.

⁵ Ibid. xiii. 7; P.G. xx. 1516.

⁶ *The First Epistle of Clement* was publicly used in a great many churches: Eus., *H.E.* iii. xvi; P.G. xx. 249. The *Didache* is cited by Eusebius in his list of νόθοι: *ibid.* iii. xxv. 4; P.G. xx. 269. *The Shepherd of Hermas*, though 'disputed by some', was publicly read in some churches at an early date: *ibid.* iii. iii. 6; P.G. xx. 217. The *Gospel of Peter* is mentioned by Serapion as in use in the church of Rhossus: quoted in Eus., *H.E.* vi. xii. 1; P.G. xx. 545. The *Apocalypse of Peter* was read in many churches: Eus., *H.E.* iii. iii. 2; P.G. xx. 217, notably at Easter, 'as a mark of special respect for it': Soz., *H.E.* vii. xix; P.G. lxvii. 1477.

important as the Eucharist.¹ Derived from the liturgy of the Synagogue, in which these were the chief items of the Sabbath morning service,² the Christian Pro-Anaphora maintained the tradition of reading and instruction in the Church. The frequency of the allusions to the subject shows the place which lections and homilies held in the liturgy of the Church.³ Whether the homily was of daily occurrence is uncertain, but it seems likely that it was, at all events in the period which we are considering, for lections are seldom mentioned without a reference to homilies, and the latter are generally based on the former.⁴ Origen indulged in scathing comments on the behaviour of those present during the readings from Scripture and the homilies he delivered upon them.⁵ It may be that the fashionable congregations of Alexandria had more time for 'listening' to sermons than their poorer fellow Christians. On the other hand, the evidence from Rome of the same period is that instruction was given on most days, if not all.⁶

Instruction to catechumens was given under Pantaenus,⁷ Clement,⁸ and Origen,⁹ in the catechetical school at Alexandria. But also Pierius, one of the presbyters in Alexandria under the emperors Carus and Diocletian,¹⁰ among others, delivered public discourses in the church.¹¹ At Antioch, too, there was a presbyter, named Dorotheus, who read the Hebrew Scriptures with facility, and expounded them wisely in the church.¹² On his arrival at Caesarea, Origen

¹ Cf. Origen, cited above, pp. 48-9, 86-7.

² The daily recitation of the *Shema'* among the Jews was, in essence, a minimum daily reading of *Törâh*. Cf. pp. 19-20 *supra*.

³ Cf. Origen, *Hom. in Exod.* vii. 5; P.G. xii. 345: *Hom. in Num.* xv. 1; P.G. xii. 683: and the passages cited already.

⁴ *Hom. in Exod.* i. 1; P.G. xii. 297: *unus sermo ex his quae recitata sunt*, etc. Cf. *Hom. in Num.* xv. 1; P.G. xii. 683.

⁵ *Hom. in Exod.* xii. 2; P.G. xii. 383: *ibid.* xiii. 3; P.G. xii. 390.

⁶ *Vide supra*, pp. 44-5.

⁷ Eus., *H.E.* v. x. 1; P.G. xx. 453.

⁸ *Ibid.* vi. vi. 1; P.G. xx. 533.

⁹ *Ibid.* vi. viii. 1; P.G. xx. 536.

¹⁰ Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* lxxvi; P.L. xxiii. 721.

¹¹ Eus., *H.E.* vii. xxxii. 27; P.G. xx. 733.

¹² *Ibid.* vii. xxxii. 3; P.G. xx. 721. An example of the kind of preaching which was common at this time occurs in the mouth of Thomas, in *Acts*

was invited 'to preach and expound the Scriptures publicly, although he had not yet been ordained presbyter'.¹ Evidently in Palestine the old custom still obtained of inviting any distinguished visitor or member of the congregation to come up and read (cf. Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth), and then if he had 'any word of exhortation' (cf. Acts xiii. 15) to say on. It was no longer so in Alexandria, and correspondence ensued between the bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea, on the one hand, and the bishop of Alexandria, on the other.² Thus matters stood in the first quarter of the third century.

of Thomas, 82–5 (ed. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, pp. 402–3), which was composed in Greek or Syriac, according to the weight of authority, at the beginning of the third century. There is probably a 'dedicatory sermon' in Eusebius' panegyric upon the building of the churches, addressed to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre: Eus., *H.E.* x. iv, esp. § 72; P.G. xx. 880.

¹ Eus., *H.E.* vi. xix. 16; P.G. xx. 569.

² Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRO-ANAPHORA IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES

THE fourth century might be described as the golden age of Patristic literature. In its annals are recorded the writings of Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Gregorys, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and, in part, Jerome and Augustine. Almost all of these have something to tell us about the way in which Christians worshipped in their days.

Moreover, the period of development and experiment in worship was drawing to a close. The liturgical order had become fixed, service books were becoming common, and four main types of the Liturgy emerged.¹ But before considering these fixed forms, so far as they concern the Pro-Anaphora, it will be well to note what information is forthcoming from the Patristic writers of the period.

By the time of Cyril of Jerusalem the Canon of Scripture was practically identical with that which we have to-day, the only differences being that the Epistle of Jeremiah was included in the Old Testament and the Apocalypse was excluded from the New Testament. 'But', said Cyril, 'let all the rest be put aside in a secondary rank. And whatever books are not read in churches, these read not even by thyself, as thou hast heard me say.'² Those who attended the services of the Church must often have heard Cyril speaking in this vein. For he frequently referred to the subject of worship in his preaching. We have from his pen a series of discourses which he delivered publicly; and it appears from a passage in the introductory lecture (*Procat.* iv) 'that it was given in the church itself before the whole

¹ These can be seen in Brightman, *L.E.W.*, where the texts are given.

² *Catech.* iv. xxxvi; P.G. xxxiii. 500.

congregation, after that portion of the daily service to which catechumens were usually admitted'.¹

The central act of worship, the Eucharist, was divided into two parts. The Pro-Anaphora, the *missa catechumenorum*, consisting of lessons, psalms, homily, and prayers, was open to all, baptized and unbaptized alike. The *missa fidelium*, or Eucharist proper, was the special privilege of the baptized. The conversion of the Empire flooded the Church with a number of converts, many of whom were Christians only in name. Corresponding to these changed conditions, we find that the Church in the fourth century, unable to cope with the great crowd of catechumens, reserved the full and complete instruction for those who expressed their intention of presenting themselves for baptism. The duration of this instruction, which in the earlier period seems to have lasted three years, became generally fixed to the season of Lent, the baptism itself taking place on Easter Eve.² In the West those who had already given in their names in order to receive baptism were called *competentes*, to distinguish them from the ordinary catechumens (*audientes*).³

Special instruction in the Mysteries appears to have been given to the faithful (*fideles*) after the dismissal of the catechumens.⁴ It was usual for a Church to have a 'house of the catechumens', a room opening on to the church,⁵ like the *Bēth ha-Midrāsh*, or house of study, which formed part of the synagogue buildings. Customs varied in different localities, so that catechetical instruction may have

¹ Gifford, *The Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem*, in the 'Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers', vol. vii, p. xli. The reference is to 'the reading of Scripture, the presence of the Ordained, the course of instruction'.

² See the article 'Baptême' in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.*, tom. ii. 1, pp. 258 et seq. *Ap. Trad.* xvii orders a catechumen to be instructed for three years, but he may be received sooner if his conduct merits it: cf. *Const. Apost.* VIII. xxxii. 16.

³ Augustine, *De Fide et Op.* vi. 9; P.L. xl. 202. ⁴ *Test.* i. 22 (tr. Cooper and Maclean, p. 69). For examples see Cyril, *Catech. Mystagog.* i-v.

⁵ *Test.* i. 19 (*ibid.* p. 63).

been given in the church in some districts, and in the 'house of the catechumens' in others. But there is no doubt that lections and homilies, that is, reading, and instruction based upon it, were also part of the Pro-Anaphora in the fourth century as they had been in the third.

We shall see in a moment that the Pro-Anaphora, when followed by the Anaphora, consisted of lections from the Scriptures interspersed with psalms, the sermon, prayers, and the dismissal of the catechumens. Moreover, in the East, where the Western custom of a daily Eucharist never became common, the old habit of daily reading and prayer seems to have continued. Thus the Pro-Anaphora formed the service on weekdays without the Anaphora following. The curious little work known as the *Apostolic Church Order*, otherwise called *Ecclesiastical Canons* and *Kerygma Petri*, which probably dates from the early fourth century,¹ recommends that a Reader shall be one who reads well, 'one who is quick to go every day to the church'.² Chrysostom speaks of the section of the Gospel which is coming on Sunday or on Saturday.³ He recommends that each one should sit down in his own home and get to know this thoroughly before coming to church.⁴ The Epistles of Paul, too, were read twice every week, and often three or four times, whenever they were celebrating the memorials of the holy martyrs.⁵ No doubt, at such times, the Gospel was read as well as the Epistle. But these were special days which were marked by a celebration of the Eucharist. The full service of the Pro-Anaphora *plus* Anaphora was held, when passages from the Old Testament were read,⁶ announced and recited by an official Reader from the *pulpit*.

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 30 note 5.

² *Vide Statute 15*, in Horner's *Statutes of the Apostles*, p. 134.

³ Chrysostom, *In Ioann. Hom.* xi. 1; P.G. lix. 77: κατὰ μίαν Σαββάτων, ἡ καὶ κατὰ Σάββατον, τὴν μελλουσαν . . . περικοπήν.

⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵ Chrys., *In Epist. ad Rom. Hom.* i. 1; P.G. ix. 391.

⁶ Chrys., *In Epist. ad Heb. Cap. v Hom.* viii. 4; P.G. lxiii. 75: καίτοι καθ' ἐκάστην ἔβδομάδα δις ἡ καὶ τρίς ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἀναγινώσκεται.

*tum.*¹ A homily, or sermon, was preached,² during which the people stood, in accordance with ancient custom.³ When the sermon was considered a good one, the people expressed their appreciation by shouting out, and one after another the Fathers condemned the practice. While Chrysostom was actually laying it down as his opinion that applause was bad, the congregation applauded him to the echo.⁴ Jerome urged Nepotian to shun it, and quoted Gregory of Nazianzus as evidence of its common occurrence in Gregory's day.⁵ Augustine pleaded for a deeper understanding of the spiritual message he uttered.⁶ In fact, the demand for sermons was so great that Chrysostom had to reprimand his congregation severely, pointing out that it was more important to listen to the Scriptures than to sermons, and that they could do this daily, if they would. The passage, though long, is so interesting that it is worth quoting in full.

'What do I come in for, you say, if I do not hear someone dis-
coursing? This is the ruin and destruction of all. For what need
is there to discourse? This necessity arises from our laziness. Why
is there any necessity for a homily? All things are clear and open
that are in the divine Scriptures. . . . But, you say, I do not know
the things that are contained in the divine Scriptures. Why do you
not know them? For are they recited in Hebrew? Are they in
Latin, or in foreign tongues? Are they not in Greek? . . . Every day,
you say, one hears the same things. Tell me, then, do you not hear
the same things in the theatres? Do you not see the same things in
the racecourses? Are not all things the same? Is it not always the
same sun that rises? Is it not the same food that we use? I should
like to ask you, since you say that every day you hear the same
things—tell me, from what Prophet was the passage that was read?

¹ Loc. cit.: καὶ ἀνέλθων ὁ ἀναγνώστης κ.τ.λ.

² Chrys., *In Joann. Hom.* xviii. 4; P.G. lix. 119: τῶν δὲ θειῶν δογμάτων ἄπαξ ἡ δἰς τῆς ἔρδουμάδος ἀκούοντες, ναυτιώμεν, διακορεῖς γνόμεθα.

³ Ibid; P.G. lix. 120.

⁴ *In Acta Apost. Hom.* xxx. 3; P.G. lx. 226.

⁵ Jerome, *Epist.* lii. 8; P.G. xxii. 534.

⁶ *Nam facile est audire Christum, facile est laudare Evangelium, facile acclamare disputatori:* Aug., *In Joannis Evang. Tract.* xlvi. 13; P.L. xxxv. 1725, et passim; cf. *In Ep. Joannis Tract.* vii. 10; P.L. xxxv. 2034.

From what Apostle, or what Epistle? But you cannot tell me. . . .
When you are questioned you are as one who never heard them. . . .¹

It is apparent that in Chrysostom's church there were set homilies on Saturdays and Sundays, possibly on the station days, and certainly on days commemorating the martyrs. These were days on which the full Eucharist was celebrated. On these days there were, of course, lections; but there were readings from the Scriptures in Greek on ordinary weekdays also. There is, indeed, no doubt as to the prominence given to the Scriptures. Owing to the increasing number of converts, as well as the new churches which were being built everywhere, Constantine wrote a letter to Eusebius asking him to supply fifty volumes of the Scriptures 'on fine parchment' for the use of the congregations in the churches.² This seems to imply a 'parish Bible' in every church at this time.

The hour of dawn continued to be the time at which the congregation assembled, as in the earlier period, for we read that

'throughout the whole Eastern Church, even when there are no commemorations of the martyrs, whenever the Gospel is to be read the candles are lighted, although the dawn be reddening the sky, not of course to scatter the darkness, but by way of showing forth our joy.'³

Whether the Gospel was read every day, in addition to the lections from the Old Testament, or not, it is probable that the weekday service continued to be held at dawn, like the service on Sundays. At least there is no evidence to the contrary, and the custom at Jerusalem, which is vouched for by the *Peregrinatio Etheriae*, was probably common throughout the East.

Before going on to discuss the use of psalms and prayers, let us take a glance at the West. By the fourth century the daily Eucharist was everywhere customary. Thus the old

¹ Chrysostom, *In Epist. II ad Thess. Cap. ii Hom.* iii. 4; P.G. lxii. 485-6.

² Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* i. xv; P.G. lxxxii. 953.

³ Jerome, *Adv. Vigilant.* vii; P.L. xxiii. 361.

distinction between Pro-Anaphora and Anaphora was largely forgotten. The liturgy of the Synagogue and the liturgy of the Upper Room, still distinct in the East in that the former was alone the basis of worship on weekdays while both together formed the background of the Sunday service, were permanently fused in the West through the introduction of a daily Eucharist. Nevertheless the old features can be readily distinguished, and the habit still persisted of dismissing catechumens at the end of that portion of the service which we have called the Pro-Anaphora. Lections and a sermon, after which the catechumens were dismissed, are mentioned as part of the public worship on Sundays.¹ The whole people also assembled in church on Saturdays.² Indeed, there were regular lections from the Prophets, frequently followed by a sermon, on ordinary weekdays at Milan.³ Ambrose says that he 'discoursed daily at the time when the lives of the patriarchs or the precepts of the Proverbs were being read', by way of instructing the *competentes* during Lent.⁴ But these homilies, like the readings, formed part of the Pro-Anaphora, the *missa catechumenorum*, which was attended by the baptized and the unbaptized alike.

Augustine uses language about lections and sermons which is strongly reminiscent of Origen. Like his Alexandrian predecessor, Augustine sets on a level with the Eucharist itself the daily hearing of the Scriptures. Speaking on Mt. vi. 11, to the *competentes*, he remarks that 'Give us this day our daily bread' cannot refer only to ordinary food, because both good and bad receive this bread from God—

'Thinkest thou there is no other bread for which the children ask? . . . Yes, surely there is. What then is that bread? and why is it called daily? . . . there is a daily bread for which the children pray. That is the word of God which is dealt out to us day by day.'⁵

¹ Ambrose, *Ep.* xx. 3; P.L. xvi. 1036. ² *Ibid.* xx. 4; P.L. xvi. 1037.

³ *Ibid.* xxii. 3, 14; P.L. xvi. 1063, 1066. ⁴ *De Myst.* i. 1; P.L. xvi. 405.

⁵ *Sermo LVI.* vi (§ 10); P.L. xxxviii. 381: *Ipse est sermo Dei, qui nobis*

96 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRO-ANAPHORA IN

A third interpretation is given in this passage, which equates 'daily bread' with the Eucharist. But the fact remains that the reading and exposition of Scripture were considered of equal importance with the Eucharist.¹ 'In expounding to you the Holy Scriptures', says Augustine, 'I as it were break bread for you.'²

The old custom of standing for sermons was maintained.³ But sermons were of set length,⁴ and it sometimes happened that people grew tired. Hence Augustine recommended that they should be allowed to sit, from the beginning if possible—

'and certain Churches beyond the sea act with much greater wisdom and foresight, in which not only the chief ministers sit to address the people, but seats are provided for the people themselves'.⁵

The context shows that Augustine is thinking of both the faithful and the catechumens, though he considers it particularly dangerous that catechumens should be put to shame by being compelled to withdraw through weakness.

From the beginning the chanting of psalms alternated with the lections, as we saw in the preceding chapter. This singing, or chanting, of psalms continued to form part of the service in the fourth and fifth centuries. An apocryphal book written during the closing years of the fourth century asserts that, 'without David it is not lawful to offer a sacrifice unto God: but it must needs be that David sing praises at the hour of the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ: as it is performed in heaven, so also

quotidie erogatur. The passage goes on: *Panis noster quotidianus est: inde vivunt non ventres sed mentes. . . . Cibus noster quotidianus in hac terra sermo Dei est, qui semper erogatur Ecclesiis.*

¹ Cf. *Sermo LVII. vii* (§ 7); P.L. xxxviii. 389: *Et quod vobis tracto, panis quotidianus est: et quod in Ecclesia lectiones quotidie auditis, panis quotidianus est: et quod hymnos auditis et dicitis, panis quotidianus est.* Cf. *ibid. LIX. iii* (§ 6); P.L. xxxviii. 401: *Et verbum Dei quod quotidie praedicatur, panis est.*

² *Ibid. xcv. i* (§ 1); P.L. xxxviii. 581.

³ Augustine, *In Joannis Evang. Tract. xxii. 3*; P.L. xxxv. 1575.

⁴ Augustine, *De Catechiz. Rudibus*, xiii (§ 18); P.L. xl. 324.

⁵ *Ibid., xiii* (§ 19); P.L. xl. 325.

is it upon earth.'¹ The Psalms also had their place in the daily Pro-Anaphora; for Chrysostom remarks,

'Thou chantest these things every day, for tell me what dost thou say? "I have laughed"? By no means. But what? "I laboured in my groaning" (Ps. vi. 6).'²

They were chanted in the evening service,³ and at funerals.⁴

In ancient times, and up to the latter part of the fourth century, the psalms were always sung as a solo. The congregation, however, repeated the last words of the chant.⁵ The execution of the liturgical chant is described in this way in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.⁶ We have seen that this was the manner of treating the psalms in the time of Tertullian, and that the Christians had probably adopted it from the Jews, for Eusebius quotes Philo on the subject. Lightfoot, misled by Socrates' story of a vision which was vouchsafed to Ignatius at Antioch, and which caused him to introduce antiphonal singing there (c. A.D. 110),⁷ tried to find a connexion between the use of antiphonal chanting among the Christians and the arrangements of the Greek Chorus.⁸ He was certainly wrong in his statement that the Jews employed this type of chant.⁹

Apart from this one passage in Socrates all the evidence goes to show that it was towards the end of the fourth century that there was brought in, side by side with the *Psalmus Responsorius*, another kind of psalmody, the antiphon, which consisted of a psalm chanted by two choirs alternately.¹⁰ It was at Antioch, in the time of Bishop Leontius (A.D. 344–57), that this custom was introduced.¹¹

¹ *Apocalypse of Paul* xxix (end); in *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 541.

² *In Epist. ad Heb. Cap. ix Hom. xv. 4*; P.G. lxiii. 122.

³ Cf. Athan., *Apolog. de fuga sua*, § 24; P.G. xxv. 676: Cassian, *De Coenob. Instit.* ii. 5; P.L. xlvi. 87. ⁴ Jerome, *Ep. cviii. 30*; P.L. xxii 905.

⁵ Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 113.

⁶ II. lvii; ed. Lagarde, p. 85: ἔτερός τις τοῦ Δαβὶδ φαλλέτω ὑμνούσ καὶ ὁ λαὸς τὰ ἀκροστίχια ὑποφαλλέτω.

⁷ Socrates, *H.E.* vi. viii; P.G. lxvii. 692.

⁸ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, vol. i, p. 31.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Cf. Duchesne, op. cit., p. 114.

¹¹ Theodoret, *H.E.*, II. xix; P.G. lxxxii. 1060. This is wrongly referred

The older custom of chanting the psalms responsively was still employed in Chrysostom's church.¹ It was the Reader's duty to chant the psalms. This was so both in the East and in the West, for in describing his flight from his church when attacked by Syrianus and a band of soldiers, Athanasius says:

'I sat down on my throne and desired the deacon to read a psalm, and the people to answer, "For His mercy endureth for ever", and then all to withdraw and depart home';²

and Augustine provides evidence of the same custom in the West:

'We had prepared for ourselves a short psalm, and had instructed the Reader to chant it; but he, through confusion at the time, as it seems, has substituted another for it. We have preferred to follow the will of God in the Reader's mistake, than our own by keeping to our plan. If then we detain you somewhat longer than usual on account of its length, do not impute it to us. . . .'³

This delightful personal anecdote is matched by two others in his *Confessions*. Speaking of the time of his baptism, Augustine says:

'How I did weep, in the hymns and canticles, keenly moved by the voices of Thy sweet-sounding Church. . . . Not long had the church of Milan begun to use this kind of consolation and exhortation, the brethren zealously joining with harmony of voice and heart. For it was a year, or not much more, since Justina, mother of the boy-emperor Valentinian, persecuted Thy servant Ambrose, on account of her heresy, to which she was seduced by the Arians. . . . Then it was first instituted that hymns and psalms should be sung after the manner of the Eastern countries, lest the people should

to in Duchesne as ii. 24. It runs thus: Οὗτοι πρῶτοι [i.e. Flavianus and Diodorus], διελόντες τὸν τῶν φαλλόντων χορούς, ἐκ διαδοχῆς φέρειν τὴν Δαυτικὴν ἔδιδαξαν μελωδίαν.

¹ In *Epist. I ad Corinth. Hom. xxxvi. 9*; P.G. lxi. 315: καὶ ὁ φάλλων φάλλει μόνος· καν πάντες ὑπηχάσσουν, ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς στόματος ἡ φωνὴ φέρεται.

² *Apologet. de fuga sua*, § 24; P.G. xxv. 676: ἀναγινώσκειν φαλμόν τοὺς δὲ λαοὺς ὑπακούειν κ.τ.λ. The story is repeated in Athan. *Hist. Arian.* § 81; P.G. xxv. 793.

³ *Ennarat. in Psalm. cxxxviii. 1*; P.L. xxxvii. 1784.

wax faint through the tedium of sorrow,¹ and from that day to this the custom is retained, many, nay almost all Thy congregations throughout other parts of the world imitating (their example).²

Augustine was undecided about the wisdom of having the psalms sung, ‘and sometimes to such a degree, as to wish the whole melody of sweet music which is used to David’s Psalter banished from my ears, and the Church’s too’. He considered the method of Athanasius safer, ‘who used to make the reader of the psalm utter it with so slight an inflexion of his voice that it was nearer speaking than singing’.³

The old synagogue method of chanting the psalms was evidently employed in the West, as in the East, till the time of Ambrose. The great bishop of Milan not only brought into the worship of his church the new Eastern form of psalmody, but also introduced hymns of his own composition which were sung ‘daily by the mouth of the whole people’.⁴ The psalms were sung in between the lections from Holy Scripture,⁵ and they were always sung standing.⁶ After the lections came the sermon, as we have seen. At its close the minister gave the cue to rise and pray, *surgentes oremus, &c.*⁷ It has been noted above that the old custom of standing for prayer later gave place to kneeling. But liturgical usages cling long after their origins have been forgotten. Thus a writer in the latter part of the fourth century says:

‘On the first day of the week we pray standing, but we do not all know the reason. It is not only because we regard ourselves as risen with Christ, and bound to seek the things above, that on the day of resurrection by standing at prayer we remind ourselves of the

¹ *Tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus moeroris taedio contabesceret, institutum est.*

² *Confess.* ix. viii (§ 15); P.L. xxxii. 770.

³ *Ibid.* x. xxxiv (§ 50); P.L. xxxii. 800: *qui tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare lectorem psalmi, ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti.*

⁴ Ambrose, *Epist.* xxi. 34; P.L. xvi. 1060.

⁵ Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 167, 168.

⁶ Augustine, *In Psalm. xxxvi Sermo iii. 2*; P.L. xxxvi. 384.

⁷ For the ascriptions used see Brightman, *J.T.S.*, vol. i, p. 109, who gives references to Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, and Fulgentius.

grace given to us, but because that day seems in a certain manner to be an image of the world to come.¹

During the whole season of Pentecost, too, it was usual to stand for prayer.² These things were part of the unwritten tradition of the Church.³ But the fact that standing at these times was singled out for mention in the fourth century suggests that on other days the congregation now knelt for prayer. Indeed, Augustine seems to take it for granted, when he says:

‘Pray without ceasing. Are we to be “without ceasing” bending the knee; prostrating the body, or lifting up our hands, that he says “Pray without ceasing”? . . .’⁴

The subjects of prayer were much the same as they had been in the preceding period. Following the lead of Tertullian and Cyprian, Augustine urged that prayer should commence with praise, then the invocation of God, and lastly the special petitions which each one desired to offer.⁵ No doubt this order was followed in the public worship of the Church. Moreover, the Lord’s Prayer was now said daily in every church ‘before the altar of God’ so that the *fideles* heard it, as Augustine told his *competentes*.⁶

Examples of the prayers used in the Pro-Anaphora occur in the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*.⁷ This is, indeed, the earliest extant service book. It may not be typical of the liturgy of Egypt, any more than the *Testament of Our Lord* is entirely representative of the service used in Syria. But both these documents give a very fair idea of the pro-anaphoral prayers of the first half of the fourth century.

¹ Basil, *De Spirit. Sanct.* xxvii. 66; P.G. xxxii. 192. Cf. the Rabbinic idea of the World to Come as one long Sabbath.

² Basil, loc. cit.

³ Jerome, *Dialog. contra Lucifer.* viii; P.L. xxiii. 172.

⁴ *Ennarat. in Psalm.* xxxvii. 14; P.L. xxxvi. 404; *numquid sine intermissione genu flectimus, corpus prosterminus aut manus levamus?* But this may indicate merely genuflexion and not actually prayer said kneeling.

⁵ *Ennarat. in Psalm.* civ. 1; P.L. xxxvi. 1390.

⁶ *Sermo LVIII. x* (§ 12); P.L. xxxviii. 399.

⁷ The full text is given in Brightman, *J.T.S.*, vol. i, pp. 99–104.

When we turn to the regular forms revealed by *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII,¹ by Chrysostom,² or in the developed Roman Mass,³ we find the same subjects of prayer and the same general outline.

¹ *Vide* Brightman, *L.E.W.*, pp. 3-27.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 470-5.

³ For a description of the Roman Mass see Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 et seq. The subject is treated at length in A. Fortescue, *The Mass. A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London 1937), and B. Botte, *Le Canon de la Messe Romaine. Édition critique. Introduction et notes* (Louvain 1935).

CHAPTER VII

THE JEWISH CONTRIBUTION TO THE PRO-ANAPHORA

IN an earlier chapter we have briefly examined the Synagogue daily service according to the Palestinian ritual of the century in which the Church came to birth. It was seen that the main elements of the service consisted in the recitation of the *Shema'* and the *'Amidāh*. We know that the worship of the Synagogue played a very great part in the development of the worship of the Church. Our examination of the latter has shown that the Church took over from the Synagogue the customs of chanting psalms, of reading portions of the Scriptures, of sermons based on the lections, and prayers. Can we go farther, and suggest that the actual prayers were borrowed from the Synagogue? Is there any evidence of the use of the *Shema'* and the *'Amidāh* in the worship of the Church?

The fact that there were daily services in the early Church, and that these services were non-Eucharistic, has become abundantly clear. If, then, the *Shema'* was the central part of the daily Synagogue service, one would expect to find its counterpart in the daily services of the Church. But such is not the case: and the reason is not far to seek. The old Gaonic traditions tell how the Jews were forbidden by the Romans to recite the *Shema'* in public. They therefore had recourse to the subterfuge of including it in the *Kedushāh* of the *'Amidāh*.¹ But at what

¹ Finkelstein, 'La Kedouscha et les Bénédictions du Schema', in *R.E.J.*, vol. xciii (1932), p. 7, gives references to *Tarbiz* ii, p. 399; Ginzberg, *Geonica*, ii. 52; *Ginze Schechter*, ii. 555; *R.E.J.*, vol. lxx, p. 134. He rightly points out that for the Jews of the end of the first century the *Shema'* had ceased to be simply a portion of the Law which it was fitting to read every morning and evening. It had become *על מלכות שמים קבלת עול*, or *l'acceptation du Royaume de Dieu* as opposed to the *Royaume de l'arrogance, qui était Rome*. Hence the opposition of the Romans to the *Shema'* and especially to the response *ב"ש' ב' מ"ל"ע* which occurs in the middle of

period of the Roman domination was the *Shema'* interdicted? There was only one big persecution of the Jews under the authority of the Romans between the fall of Jerusalem and the time of Rab. This was at the time of the later edicts of Hadrian against Bar Cochba. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that it was owing to the Hadrianic persecutions that the *Shema'* was dropped from the public worship of the Synagogue and that the *Kedushāh*, containing the *Shema'*, was added to the '*Amīdāh*' in Palestine.

The same interdiction naturally fell upon the Jewish-Christian party within Judaism, which was probably only loosely attached to the parent religion at this time. If Jews were forbidden to say the *Shema'*, then so also was the Jewish-Christian community. There can be no reasonable doubt that Jesus recited the *Shema'* when he took part in the service at Nazareth and read the *Haftārāh*.¹ Paul is equally likely to have recited it in the synagogues of the Dispersion. The early Christian community, assuming that it ever followed their custom, was forcibly restrained from doing so by the Romans about A.D. 135. By the time that the Jews were free to restore the *Shema'* to their daily service, the Christian Church was developing along lines of its own. The growing hatred of Jews and Judaism was not compatible with the reinsertion of the Synagogue's central declaration of faith in the services of the Church. Moreover, the Church was already feeling after an expression of belief in the Trinity. Naturally the *Shema'* could not be recited in its Jewish form by Christians without a complete denial of the pre-eminent place held by Jesus, so soon at least as they began to think out the relationship of the Father to the Son. Tertullian, for example, declared that 'what we worship is the One God who fashioned this

it. Ginzberg's comments on this explanation of the phenomenon (*R.E.J.*, vol. xciii, pp. 76-7) do not carry conviction. His objections depend on the single passage in b.Pes. 56a.

¹ Lk. iv. 17.

whole world';¹ he strenuously maintained the Unity of God;² but he referred to the words of the *Shema'* as if they were now definitely superseded, for otherwise it must have followed that the Father should himself seem to have come down.³ There is thus a double reason for the absence of the *Shema'* from the early service books of the Church and from most of the patristic literature. It had already disappeared.

But it was otherwise with the Decalogue, which in the pre-Christian Synagogue service followed the *Shema'*. It has been suggested that a reference to the recitation of the Decalogue is concealed in Pliny's words concerning the oath with which Christians bound themselves not to commit certain crimes.⁴ In early Christian literature considerable attention is paid to the Decalogue. We have already noted (p. 30 above) the emphasis which is laid upon it in Irenaeus and in the *Didache* (i, ii). Irenaeus, indeed, goes so far as to say that if anyone does not observe it he has no salvation.⁵ A Christian Gnostic exposition of it occurs in Clement of Alexandria.⁶ Origen's *Hom. in Exod. viii*⁷ is a sermon, or *midrash*, on the first three commandments of the Decalogue. Possibly it is one of a course of addresses on the subject, for its length is about the same as that of his other sermons and no doubt he found it difficult to treat of the whole Decalogue in one discourse. The Ten Commandments were even recited as a charm to drive away evil spirits.⁸ Superstition with regard to the

¹ *Apol.* xvii; P.L. i. 431.

² *Adv. Hermog.* iv, xvii; P.L. ii. 201, 212.

³ *Adv. Prax.* xiii; P.L. ii. 169.

⁴ C. J. Kraemer on 'Pliny and the Early Church Service' in *Journal of Classical Philology*, vol. xxix (1934), p. 293 et seq.; E. C. Ratcliff on 'Christian Worship and Liturgy' in *The Study of Theology*, ed. K. E. Kirk, London 1939, p. 419. Pliny stated (*Ep. ad Trajan.* xcvi) that the Christians were accustomed *stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furga, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum adpellati abnegarent.*

⁵ *Adv. Haer.* IV. xv. 1; P.G. vii. 1012.

⁶ *Strom.* vi. xvi; P.G. ix. 357 et seq.

⁷ P.G. xii. 550.

⁸ Cf. *Acts of Pilate*, xv. 6; see *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 111 (top).

number ten was scouted by Tertullian, yet he confessed to the belief that the period from the moment of conception up to birth at the beginning of the tenth month initiated man into the Ten Commandments.¹

We know that the Decalogue was dropped out of the Synagogue service 'because of the fault-finding of the heretics (*Minim*)' who said that this only, and not the *Shema'*, was given to Moses at Sinai.² The identity of the *Minim* is a thorny problem.³ But it is probable that these particular *Minim* are to be classed with the *Nōtzerīm* of the twelfth Benediction of the '*Amidāh*'⁴ and those referred to in the following passage from the Talmud:

'Why did they⁵ not fast on Sunday? Said R. Johanan, Because of the Jewish-Christians (*Nōtzerīm*).'⁶

The assumption that the early Christians took over the Decalogue from the Synagogue and continued to recite it as part of their daily public worship, while omitting the *Shema'*, will explain both the sudden decision by the Jewish authorities to omit the Decalogue from their daily service and the great prominence accorded to it in early Christian literature.

The Benedictions which now precede and follow the *Shema'* in the Jewish Prayer Book were not all in use in the first century A.D. Probably the first of these Benedictions, *Yōtzēr 'Or*, alone goes back to the usage of the pre-Christian period. It is, therefore, the more striking to find

¹ *De Anima*, xxxvii; P.L. ii. 758.

² b.Ber. 12a; j.Ber. i. 8 (4), fol. 3c.

³ For the *Minim* and liturgical variations, see Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London 1903), pp. 199–206 and 308–14. On their attitude to the Divine Unity, see *Tanhuma*, *Bereshit* § 7 (ed. Buber, fol. 3a).

⁴ See the table on p. 119.

⁵ Those of the *Ma'amad* who were assembled in the synagogues.

⁶ b.Ta'an. 27b. The text runs thus: *באחד בשבת מא טעמא לא אמר רב כי יוחנן מפני הנוצרים*. Two other explanations follow in the names of Samuel b. Nahamānī and Resh Lakish respectively: viz. 'because Sunday is the third day after the creation of man', 'because of the additional soul'. But the authority of R. Johanan is at least sufficient to show that that was one of the reasons for abstaining from fasting on Sunday. It should be noted, too, that Simeon b. Lakish is constantly his halakic opponent. Samuel b. Nahamānī belonged to the next generation of Amoraim.

a total absence of dependence on the other Benedictions in the early Christian prayers.¹ On the other hand, *Yōtzēr 'Ōr*, the blessing for the gift of light which was always recited at dawn, seems to have provided the *raison d'être* for a Christian Hymn in Praise of the Dawn which was daily recited at the same hour in the Church.² It is impossible to say whether the actual wording of the *Yōtzēr* Benediction was taken over into the liturgy of the Church. We have no record of the Christian prayer before A.D. 350, but we know from Tertullian that a thanksgiving was offered daily *ingressu lucis*. As we have seen, the *Apostolic Tradition* ordered prayer to be offered at dawn, and the *Peregrinatio Etheriae* describes the service as it was held at Jerusalem in the fourth century. Moreover, there has been much controversy with regard to the original form of *Yōtzēr 'Ōr* in the Synagogue service.³ It is therefore useless to look for parallel passages, which may indicate borrowing, in the modern *Yōtzēr* Benediction and the fourth-century Hymn of Praise for the Dawn. The fact remains that both in the Synagogue and in the Church there was a thanksgiving for the gift of light at that hour. It need occasion no surprise that the Christian prayer, as

¹ Oesterley (*The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford 1925) attempts to demonstrate the dependence of certain Christian prayers on 'Ahabāh and Geullāh, but his evidence is inconclusive. See, for example, his quotations from *Clement* (op. cit., p. 139) and *Geullāh*. The resemblance is merely one of 'tone and spirit'. There is, in fact, greater verbal similarity between the Clementine prayer and Benediction 2 of the 'Amīdāh.

² This is evident from *Testament of Our Lord*, i. 26, 32. *Vide supra*, pp. 53-4.

³ For the literature see Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst* (Frankfurt 1931), p. 17 and especially the note on p. 513. The earliest text may be represented by the Oxford MS. of Sa'adyah (Bodl. MS. Hunt 448, fol. 11b) which runs: בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם יוֹצֵר אֹור וּבָרוּךְ אַתָּה כָּל הַמְאִיר לְאָרֶץ וּלְדָרְכֵינוּ עֲלֵינוּ בְּרִחָמִים רַבִּים וּטוּבוּ מַחְדֵשׁ בְּכָל יּוֹם תָּמִיד מְעָשָׂה בְּרִאָתְךָ יְהוָה יוֹצֵר הַמְאוֹרָות. This agrees essentially with the Palestinian text printed by S. Schechter, *J.Q.R.*, vol. x, pp. 654-5, and with the shorter *Yōtzēr* for the use of individuals given in the *Seder Rab 'Amrām* (ed. Frumkin, p. 194). For the most recent study of the subject see L. Finkelstein, 'La Kedouscha et les Bénédicitions du Schema', in *R.E.J.*, vol. xciii (1932), pp. 1-26.

we have it in its fourth-century dress, spiritualized the thanksgiving for the transition from darkness to light so as to make it a hymn of praise for the promise of immortal light.¹ The same change of emphasis was achieved also in the developed Synagogue prayer,² for the same process of spiritualizing the liturgy was at work.

The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (lix–lx) preserves a prayer which in theme and style may be taken as representative of the Roman solemn prayer of the end of the first century.³ Its phraseology has been compared with that of the '*Amidāh*' in the Synagogue service.⁴ There would seem to be a need for greater caution, however, in asserting direct dependence on the Synagogue prayers than has been displayed by writers in the past.⁵ The '*Amidāh*' was not complete by the time Clement wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians (*c.* A.D. 96). It was in process of formation, like the pro-anaphoral prayers in the Church. Both employed verses of the Scriptures and phrases which had probably become familiar through frequent repetition or the authority of some Rabbi. Some of the Benedictions of the '*Amidāh*' were already ancient by the close of the first century, and these would, doubtless, continue to be recited by the Jewish-Christian community. The first and second Benedictions⁶ appear to have been incorporated in the prayer in *r. Clement*. They still had their place in Christian worship in the fourth century according to the *Didascalia*, which also contains the closing Benedictions (Nos. 17 and 18 on pages 122–4) called *הוֹדָה* and *עֲבוֹדָה* and *ברָכַת כְהַנִּים* (בְרָכַת כָהָנִים) and a Gnostic form of the fourth Benediction from the Sabbath

¹ *Test. i.* 26.

² Cf. L. Ginzberg, *Geomica* (New York 1909), vol. i, p. 79.

³ E. C. Ratcliff, *The Study of Theology* (ed. K. E. Kirk), p. 419.

⁴ Ibid. Cf. Oesterley, op. cit., pp. 127 et seq.

⁵ e.g. F. H. Chase, 'The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church', in *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. iii (edited J. Armitage Robinson, Cambridge 1891); W. O. E. Oesterley, op. cit. *Vide supra*, pp. 75–6.

⁶ See the table on pp. 114–15.

'*Amidāh*.¹ All these prayers go back to pre-Christian times, and we can safely assume that they kept their place in the services of the Church after the Church became a separate institution from the Synagogue. On the other hand, the third Benediction (the *Kedushāh*) was a new thing, and it is impossible to maintain that it, too, is embedded in the prayer of *x Clement*.² The original form of the *Kedushāh* has been shown to have borne no resemblance to that early Christian prayer.³ Still less can the *Kedushāh* have become the *Sanctus* of the Anaphora, which 'must have been borrowed by the Church from the Synagogue at an early date'.⁴ There is no *Sanctus* in the Hippolytean Anaphora, and its introduction into the liturgy is later than Hippolytus.⁵ Nor is there any mention of it in connexion with worship in the writings of the Fathers until Cyril of Jerusalem.⁶

Thus the '*Amidāh*' cannot be treated as an entity when answering the question, Is there any evidence of the use of the '*Amidāh*' in the worship of the Church? It is necessary always to distinguish between those Benedictions which formed the common heritage of first-century Judaism and the party within it which later became known as the Christian Church, and those Benedictions which were added to the '*Amidāh*' during the lifetime of Jesus or that of the infant Church. A few of the Benedictions undoubtedly found their place in the prayers of the Church, and it is possible that a Christian '*Amidāh*' was recited daily. But the chief contribution which the Synagogue made in this connexion was in the thought and the language of prayer.

¹ Cf. Kohler, art. 'Didascalia', *J.E.*, vol. iv, pp. 593b–594b.

² Oesterley, op. cit., p. 127.

³ *Vide supra*, pp. 76–7.

⁴ Art. 'Kedushāh' in *J.E.*, vol. vii, p. 463b. Cf. Oesterley, op. cit., p. 147, who confuses the *Trisagion* with the *Sanctus* (pp. 145–7). See Glossary.

⁵ W. H. Frere, *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer* (S.P.C.K. 1938), pp. 57 et seq.; E. C. Ratcliff, op. cit., p. 432.

⁶ None of the passages referred to by Oesterley provides evidence of its use as part of the liturgy. They merely refer to the angels giving glory to God in the words of Isaiah, and similar themes.

If the Church did not always borrow the actual words from the Synagogue, it embodied familiar phrases in its own petitions, and the subjects of prayer were the same in both.¹

The use of the congregational response '*Amēn*' derives directly from the Synagogue. Among the Jews the '*Amīdāh*' was not said by the people, but they punctuated the sentences as read by the *Hazzān* with the response '*Amēn*'.² This simple '*Amēn*', already noted in the New Testament, invariably followed the prayers in every Christian Church.³

On the other hand, the custom of singing *Hallēl* (*vide supra*, pp. 14–15) does not seem to have been well known in the Church before the fourth century. In St. John's vision (Rev. xix. 6) the heavenly choir sang *Alleluia* to the Lord Almighty. But there are few, if any, references to it in the writers of the first three centuries. No doubt Pss. cxiii–cxviii and Ps. cxxxvi were recited among the other psalms which were chanted in the Church. In this sense the custom of singing the *Alleluia* was very ancient. But there was no parallel to the Jewish *Hallēl*, no adaptation of this chant to the liturgical service until quite late.⁴

There is some reason to believe that the first paragraph of the ancient Aramaic doxology called *Kaddish* may have

¹ *Vide supra*, pp. 78–80. Among phrases reminiscent of the Synagogue the following may be cited: 'Thanks for all things be given unto God the Omnipotent Ruler and King of the Universe' (מלך העולם), Eus., *H.E.* x. 1, i; 'O God, the exceeding Great and All-wise and King of the Ages' (מלך העולמים), *Gospel of Bartholomew*, ii. 13, in *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 171; the same phrase occurs in *Acts of Paul*, x (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 294), *Apocalypse of Paul*, xxi (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 537), *ibid.* xxix (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 541); the Archangel asks Paul 'art thou more merciful than the Lord God who is blessed for ever?' (אליהם המברך לנצח) in *Apocalypse of Paul*, xl (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 546); 'there shall be heard one harmonious melody in us, praising in hymns that God who created all things (בורא את הכל)', Iren., *Adv. Haer.* II. xxviii. 3; P.G. vii. 806.

² b. Rosh Hashanah 32a. Cf. *Acts of John*, xciv et seq. (*Apoc. N.T.*, p. 253), where *Amen* is said by the Apostles after every verse of the hymn recited by Jesus.

³ On the use of the response see Cabrol, *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.*, s.v. 'Amen'.

⁴ Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

influenced the Lord's Prayer.¹ A digression here on the Jewish element in the Lord's Prayer would, however, take us much too far afield.² In nearly all ancient liturgies the Lord's Prayer was said between the consecration of the elements and the communion.³ It does not seem to have had a place in the pro-anaphoral service.

To sum up our conclusions: the *Shema'* has left no trace upon the liturgy of the Church, the Decalogue was taken over from the daily Synagogue service, while the '*Amidāh*' of pre-Christian days seems to have been elaborated by the Synagogue and the Church to suit the individual needs of both. Indeed the history of these two institutions during the early centuries of our era is one of parallel growth. There was the same emphasis on prayer, the same reverence for the Scriptures which were read and expounded in their assemblies, the same love for the psalmody of David. In some respects the Church extended the practice of the Synagogue. Scripture lections and homilies among the Jews had been confined to Mondays, Thursdays, Sabbaths, and festivals. The Church, in most localities, made these things part of the daily public worship; and they were always included in the Pro-Anaphora when the Anaphora of the Eucharist followed.

Gradually the gulf between Church and Synagogue widened. As the centuries passed the mutual hatred and misunderstanding grew. Yet the Jewish contribution to the Pro-Anaphora was so firmly embedded in the worship of the Church that it endured, although the origin of most of it was already lost to view.

¹ For a discussion of the subject see Chase, 'The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church' in *Texts and Studies*, vol. I. iii (Cambridge 1891).

² See I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 2nd Series (Cambridge 1924), pp. 94–108, where all the relevant literature is cited.

³ *Vide* Brightman, *L.E.W. (passim)*.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

OUR survey is now complete. We have gone through the writings of the Fathers which have come down to us from the first four centuries, and the kaleidoscope of scattered references to worship has formed a picture for us. It has become clear that the Church's debt to the Synagogue in the matter of worship is great indeed.

At the outset it was noted that the commonly accepted theory sees in the Eucharist a fusion of the liturgy of the Synagogue with the liturgy of the Upper Room. Srawley recognized the original distinctness of the two services, though he found himself quite unable to trace the fusion of the two elements. Cabrol not only noted the connexion between the Sabbath morning service of the Synagogue and the Mass of the Catechumens (the Pro-Anaphora): he also hinted at the possibility of services that were not joined to the Eucharistic synax, at least during the first three centuries. Lietzmann's view that the Eucharistic meal, originally held in the late afternoon, was transferred to Sunday morning about the middle of the second century and joined with the service of reading and preaching stood midway between the other two theories. All these statements were correct so far as they went. But they do not set the Synagogue and the Upper Room in their true perspective.

The Synagogue Sabbath morning service was not the only occasion of public worship among the Jews. They also met together to worship on weekdays, and the liturgy on those days was the same as on the Sabbath, except for the readings from Scripture and certain slight alterations.

Thus it has been suggested in the preceding pages that the Christian week included worship not only on the Lord's Day but on every day as well. On Saturdays and Sundays the Eucharist was always celebrated from the

beginning. In other words, the service on these days was composed of the Pro-Anaphora and the Anaphora. Some local churches followed the same custom also on the Wednesday and Friday station days, while other places probably employed the Pro-Anaphora alone. The Pro-Anaphora alone formed the normal service everywhere on weekdays. But here again there may have been much diversity of practice, for while it is certain that at Rome and Alexandria and in most other places readings from the Scriptures and instruction were of daily occurrence, it is possible that some churches dispensed with these essential elements of the service and confined themselves to prayer and praise.

Of what, then, did the Pro-Anaphora consist? It was composed of prayers, lections, homilies, and psalms: and all these elements were derived directly from the Synagogue. They may be seen in the service described by Justin Martyr. They appear again in the *Sacramentary of Sarapion* and the *Testament of Our Lord*. Finally, in the developed liturgies set out by Brightman (*Liturgies Eastern and Western*), we find the old Pro-Anaphora transformed and elaborated, altered and expanded, but still in essence the same. If it be asked why no copy of the daily pro-anaphoral service has survived until our time, it should be remembered that no extant sacramentary is earlier than the fourth century. Service books were unknown in the early Church as in the contemporary Synagogue. Prayers were recited from memory and handed down from generation to generation. When the prayers were first written it is impossible to say. It is probable that they were not committed to writing at all until the Pro-Anaphora had become fixed. By that time it was already in process of being absorbed in the daily Eucharist in the West, as well as in the Canonical Hours in the East and in the West. But there can be no doubt that public worship at dawn and at sunset was the primitive tradition of the early Church.

Thus we are forced to conclude that the influence of the Synagogue upon the worship of the Church is to be seen in the type of worship and the times at which public prayer was held. Such early Christian prayers as have survived do not suggest any wholesale borrowing from the liturgy of the Synagogue. Individual phrases, and occasionally whole sentences, are reminiscent of the wording of the Jewish prayers. But the Christians' debt to the past is revealed rather in the subjects of their prayers and the general framework of their services than in the phraseology employed in their petitions.

Amid all the wealth of material with which the student of the liturgy is confronted there are bound to be many points which remain obscure. The natural verbosity of many of the writers, and the fact that they were writing for people who knew the customs of their own day, make it difficult sometimes for us, who are not so familiar with their thought or with their habits, to sense the exact nuance which was intended. Nevertheless, there is enough light amid the obscurity of the landscape to enable us to grasp the salient points in the picture.

THE SHEMONAH ESREH OR AMIDAH

APPENDIX

Text of the Palastiman Amrda'h

Modern version as printed in Singier (pp. 44-54)

להוושע מכלכל
חיה בחסד
מחיה מתים
ברחמים רבים
סומך נפלים
ורופא חולים
ומתיר אסורים
ומקיים אמותנו
ליישוי עפר מי
כמוך בעל
גבורות ומי
דומה לך מלך
מימות ומוחיה
ומצמיחה ישועה
ונאמן אתה
להחיות מותים
ברוך אתה יי
מחיה המתים :

save;* Thou sustaineſt the living in lovingkindneſs, Thou quickenest the dead with great mercy, ſupporteſt those that are fallen, healeſt the ſick, looſeſt them that are bound, and keepeſt Thy [His] faith with them that ſleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Master of mighty acts, and who reſemblēſt Thee? O King that ſendeth death and reviueſt again, and cauſeſt ſalvation to ſpring forth, and art faithful to quicken the dead: blesſed art Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.

מְקִים מַתִּים
מֵשִׁיב הָרוֹح
וּמוֹרִיד הַטֶּל
מִכְלָלָל חַיִם
מַחְיָה הַמַּתִּים
כְּהָרָף עַז
יִשְׁוֹעָה לְנוֹ
תָּצְמִיחַ בָּרוֹךְ
אַתָּה יי
מַחְיָה הַמַּתִּים :

that liveth for ever, that raiseth the dead, that maketh the wind to blow, that sendeth down the dew; that sustaineth the living, that quickeneth the dead; in the twinkling of an eye Thou makeſt ſalvation to ſpring forth for us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.

BENEDICTION No. 3. קדושת השם (Rosh Hash-shanah, iv. 5.) Date: A.D. 10-40.

אתה קדוש ושמן
קדוש וקדושים
בכל יום הללוך
סללה ברוך אתה
יי האל הקדוש :

Thou art holy and Thy Name is holy, and holy ones praise Thee every day. Se-laḥ. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the holy God.

קדוש אתה
ונורא שםך ואין
אלוה מלבדיך
ברוך אתה יי
האל הקדוש :

Holy art Thou and Thy Name is to be feared, and there is no God beside Thee; Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the holy God.

* From the day after the Rejoicing of the Law until the eve of Passover add:

משיב הרוח Thou cauſeſt the wind to blow
 ומוֹרִיד הנֶגֶם and the rain to fall;

(Singer, p. 44; cf. Ta'an. i. 1, Ber. v. 2.) 115

Text of the Palestinian Amida

Modern version as printed in Stinger (pp. 44-54) Translation

BENEDICTION No. 6. תְּבָנֵת נַחַז ב. אֶבְוֹדָה זָרָה, 8, or תְּמִימָן ב. מֶג., 17b). Date: First century B.C.

Graceful, Lord, who dost abundantly forgive.
And forgive, O Lord, who art merciful. Blessed art Thou, O
Thine eyes, for great is Thy
mercy. Blessed art Thou, O
gresions to pass from before
thee.

BENEDICTION No. 7. תְּבָנֵת נַחַז ב. מֶג., 17b). Date: A.D. 40-70.

Look upon our affliction and
plead our cause, and redeem
us for the sake of Thy Name,
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
Look upon our affliction and
redeem us and redeem
the Redeemer of Israel.

BENEDICTION No. 8. תְּבָנֵת נַחַז ב. אֶבְוֹדָה זָרָה, 8, or תְּמִימָן ב. מֶג., 17b). Date: First century B.C.

Heal us, O Lord, and we
shall be healed; save us and
we shall be saved; for Thou to
rise up full healing for all our
wounds, for Thou, God,
King, art a faithful and
merciful physician. Blessed art Thou,
O Lord, who hast the sick of Thy [His]
people Israel.

תְּבָנֵת נַחַז ב. מֶג., 17b). Date: First century B.C.

Heal us, O Lord, and we
shall be healed; save us and
we shall be saved; for Thou to
rise up full healing for all our
wounds, for Thou, God,
King, art a faithful and
merciful physician. Blessed art Thou,
O Lord, who hast the sick of Thy [His]
people Israel.

BENEDICTION No. 9. (B. 1717 N. 1712 B. M. Eg. 17b.) Date: 149-30 B.C.

Modern version as printed in Simeon (pp. 44-54)

Text of the Palestinian Amiditha Translation

BENEDICTION NO. 10. (Hannya p13p b. Mieg. 17b.) Date: A.D. 40-70.

Below the great horn for our liberation and lift a banner to
liberate us, O Lord our God, this year and every year
Bless for us, God, this year for our welfare,
fare, with every kind of the
kind of the produce thereof
for (our) welfare, and give a
blessing upon the race of the
earth; * O satisfy us with
end of our redemption; and
give dew and rain upon the
race of the earth and satisfy
the world from the terrors
of Thy goodness, and do
Thou give a blessing upon
the work of our hands.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
who blesseth the years.

Below the great horn for our liberation and lift a banner to
liberate us, O Lord our God, this year and every year
Bless for us, God, this year for our welfare,
fare, with every kind of the
kind of the produce thereof
for (our) welfare, and give a
blessing upon the race of the
earth; * O satisfy us with
end of our redemption; and
give dew and rain upon the
race of the earth and satisfy
the world from the terrors
of Thy goodness, and do
Thou give a blessing upon
the work of our hands.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
who blesseth the years.

Bless us, O God, this year kind of the prod
for (our) welfare,
blessing upon the
earth; * O satisfy
thy goodness, my
year like other
years blessed art thou
who blessest the

* From the 4th December to the first day of Passover substitute for the last clause the following:

BENEDICTION NO. 10. (נְתָנוּ פָּרָשָׁה וְמֵגָּה, ۱۷ب.) Date: A.D. ۴۰-۷۰.

Below the great horn for our liberation and lift a banner to us now in Zion.

לקבץ נליותינו
וקבצנו ייחד
מארבע כנופות
הארץ ברוך אתה
יי מקבץ נדחי
עמו ישראל :

gather our exiles, and gather us as one from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the dispersed of Thy [His] people Israel.

נס לקובץ
נאליותינו
ברוך אתה יי
מקבץ נדחי
עמו ישראל :

to gather our exiles. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the dispersed of Thy [His] people Israel.

BENEDICTION No. 11. (ברכת הדין) b.Meg. 17b.) Date: A.D. 40-70.

השובה שופטינו
כבראשנה ויוועצינו
כבותחלה וחסר
מננו גיאן ואנחתה
ומלך עליינו אתה
יי לבך בחסד
ובברחים וצדקו
במשפט ברוך
אתה יי מלך אהוב
צדקה ומשפט :

Restore our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as at the beginning; remove from us grief and sighing; and reign Thou over us, Thou alone O Lord, in lovingkindness and mercy; and establish our innocence in judgement. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, King, that lovest righteousness and judgement.

השובה שופטינו
כבראשונה
וויועצינו
כבותחלה ומולך
עלינו אתה
לבך ברוך
אתה יי אהוב
המשפט :

Restore our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and reign Thou over us, Thou alone. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who lovest judgement.

BENEDICTION No. 12. (ברכת המיניהם) b.Ber. 28b.) Date: A.D. 90-117.

ולמלשינם אל
תהי תקוה וככל
הרשעה כבגע
תאבך וכל איביך
מהריה יכרתו
וממלכות זוזן

And for slanderers let there be no hope, and let all wickedness perish as in a moment; may all Thine enemies be soon cut off, and the dominion of arrogance do Thou

למשומדים אל
תהי תקוה
וממלכות זוזן
מהריה תעקר
בימינו והונזרים
והמינים כרגע

For apostates let there be no hope, and the dominion of arrogance do Thou speedily root out in our days; and let Christians and heretics perish as in a moment, let them be

Translation

Text of the Palestinian 'Amidah

Translation

blotted out of the book of life;
living and let them not be
written with the righteous.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
who humblesst the arrogant.

speedily root out and scatter,
cast down, and humble
speedily in our days. Blessed
art Thou, O Lord, who
shatterest enemies and hum-
blesst the arrogant.

תְּלִוָּה :
 אֲנָשָׁה לְאַנָּשָׁה
 כְּלִיל אֲנָשָׁה .. וְאֶל
 כְּאַלְמָן כְּאַלְמָן
 לְאַלְמָן לְאַלְמָן
 כְּאַלְמָן נְאַלְמָן לְאַלְמָן

Towards the righteous prose-
lytes may Thy tender mer-
cies be stirred; and bestow
a good reward upon us to-
gether with those that do
Thy will. Blessed art Thou,
O Lord, the trust of the
righteous.

କୁଳାଙ୍ଗା
କୁଳାଙ୍ଗା
କୁଳାଙ୍ଗା
କୁଳାଙ୍ଗା
କୁଳାଙ୍ଗା

Towards the righteous and
the pious, and towards the
elders of Israel, Thy people the
House of Israel, and towards the
remnant of their tribes,
and towards the righteous the
proselytes, and towards us
may Thy tender mercies be
stirred, O Lord our God; and
bestow a good reward upon
all who do trust faithfully in
Thy Name; and set our por-
tion with them for ever; and
let us not come to shame
because in Thee we have
trusted. Blessed art Thou,
O Lord, the stay and trust
of the righteous.

ՀԵԼՈՅՈՒԹԻՒՆ
Ա ԱԱԾ ԼԵՐԱԿ
ՏԱՐԱ ԸԼԼ ԽԱՎ
ԼԵՆ ԷԼՄ Ը. ԸԼ
ԱԳԴԱ ԲԱՎՈ ՀԱԼՅՈ
ՏԱՅԼ ԾԽԱՎ ԼԱԾ
ԱԼ ՀՀՀ ՎԵԼԱՄ.Օ
ԽՎԱՆ ԱՄ ԱԾԼ
ԱՎԱ ԼԱՀԱԼ Ա
ԼԵԳ ԻՆ ԱՏԼԾ ԼԵԳ.Ի
ԼԵԳ ԵՀ.ԱՎ ՕՂԼԼԱ
ՏԱԼ Ը.Ս ՎԼԽԿ
ԱՊԱԼԾ ԼԵԳ ԻՇ
ԻՀ ԱՏԼԾԾ ԼԵԳ

BENEDICTION No. 14. (Prayer for Jerusalem.) Date: 168–165 B.C.

ולירושלים עירך
ברחמים תשוב
ותשכון בתוכה
כאשר דברת ובנה
אותה בקרוב
בימינו בנין עולם
וכסא דוד מהרה
לתוכה תכין
ברוך אתה יי'
בונה ירושלים :

And to Jerusalem Thy city
return Thou in mercy, and
dwell therein as Thou hast
spoken; and build her soon
in our days as an everlasting
building, and speedily estab-
lish there the throne of
David. Blessed art Thou, O
Lord, the builder of Jeru-
salem.

רְחֵם יי' אֱלֹהִים
בָּרוּחַ מֶרְכָּזָם
עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל עַמְּךָ
וְעַל יְרוּשָׁלָם
עִירָּךְ וְעַל צִיּוֹן
מִשְׁכָּן כְּבוֹדךְ
וְעַל הַכִּלְךְ וְעַל
מִגְּנָן וְעַל
מֶלֶכְתָּה בֵּית
דוֹיד מָשִׁיחָה
צִדְקָךְ בָּרוּךְ
אתָה יי' אֱלֹהִים
דָּרְיד בּוֹנָה
יְרוּשָׁלָם :

Be merciful, O Lord our
God, in Thy great mercy,
towards Israel Thy people,
and towards Jerusalem Thy
city, and towards Zion the
abiding place of Thy glory,
and towards Thy temple
and Thy habitation, and to-
wards the kingdom of the
house of David, Thy right-
eous anointed one. Blessed
art Thou, O Lord God of
David, the builder of Jeru-
salem.

BENEDICTION No. 15. (At Zemach David b.Meg. 18a.) Date: Probably added to the Babylonian *'Amidāh* in this form
c. A.D. 50–70 (Finkelstein, J.Q.R. N.S. vol. xvi, p. 43), but originally joined with Bened. 14 (idem; cf. I. Abrahams,
Companion to the Daily P.B. p. lxv.)

את זמך דוד עבדך
מהירה ת贠יה
וקרנו תרום
בישועתך כי לישועתך
קיוינו כל היום ברוך
אתה יי' מצמיה
קרן ישועה :

The offspring of David, Thy
servant, speedily cause Thou
to spring forth; and his horn
do Thou raise up through
Thy salvation, for for Thysal-
vation we are hoping every
day. Blessed art Thou, O
Lord, who causest the horn
of salvation to flourish.

BENEDICTION No. 16 (Babylonian). (תְּזִבְּנָה מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל) = BENEDICTION No. 15 (Palestinian). Date: Pre-Maccabean.

Modern version as printed in Singner (pp. 44-54)

Hear our voice, O Lord our God, spare us and have mercy upon us, and accept our offering, O King, turn us not empty from Thy presence, O our Saviour, God that hearest prayers and supplications art Thou: for a God is He who is merciful and gracious; a player in mercy and favour; upon us, and accept our offering, O King, turn us not empty from Thy presence, O our Saviour, God that hearest prayers and supplications art Thou: for a God is He who is merciful and gracious;

BENEDICTION No. 17 (Babylonian). (נַתְנָא בָּבִילוֹנִיאָן) = BENEDICTION No. 16 (Palestinian). Date: Pre-Christian; perhaps pre-Maccabean.

O Lord, who hearest prayer.
"THE 175

BENEDICTION No. 18 (Babylonian). (No. 17 b.Ber. 29a, etc.) = BENEDICTION No. 17 (Palestinian). Date: Pre-
Christian; perhaps pre-Maccabean.

We give thanks to Thee Who
art the Lord our God and
the God of our fathers, for
all the good things, for
which Thou hast wrought
lovingkindness, and the mercy
of thy goodness, the
and done with us and with
our fathers before us: and if
we said, Our feet slip; Thy
lovingkindness, O Lord, up-
held us. Blessed art Thou,
O Lord, unto Whom it is
good to give thanks.

ՎԼ ԳՐԱՄԻ:
ԽԱԿ և ՍԱԼԵ
ՀՕՅԼԻ ԸԼԼ
ԼԵԿՐԻ ԽՈԼ և
ԽԵԼԻ ՇԱԿ
ԱՀԳԻ ԼԽ
ՏԱՄ ԼՅ ԽԵԼԱՅ
ԹԻՎԱԿԻ ԼԱՐԱՎԱ
ԱԽՈՅ ԼԵԼԱԳ
ԲՂ ԾԳ ՍԱԼԵՄ
ԼԵԿՐԻ ԽԵԼԱՅ
և ԽԿԱՐ
ՎԼ ԽԱՎ ԱԽ
ԱԼԼՈ ԽԵԼ

be ever acceptable to Thee.
And may our eyes behold
Thy return in mercy to Zion.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord,
who restorest Thy [His]
Divine Presence unto Zion.

Christian; perhaps pre-Maccabean.

We give thanks to Thee Who art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers and ever and ever; the Shield of our lives, the Salvation art Thou from generation to generation; we give thanks to Thee and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are committed unto Thy hand, and for our souls which are entrusted to Thee, and for Thy miracles which are daily with us, and for Thy wonders and Thy benefits which are (through) Thy mercy, and noon: (Thou art) Good, and fail not; (Thou art) the

ԱՆԱԼ ԱՎԱԽՈ Ը
 ԱԿԱԾ Ը ԳԽ ԾԳ
 ԲԼԸ ԼԵՋՆ ԼԵԱԽ. Ծ
 ԼԱԼԵԱՆ ԱՋԾԿ ԾԱ
 ՏԱՇ ԼԱՑ ՇԵՂԱԽԱՆ. Լ
 ՏԱԼ ԱՋԾԿ ԱՌ
 ՄԱՋԱԽԱ ԳԼ ԻՐԿ
 ԼԱՑ ԹԵՇԱԿ
 ՄԱՋԱԽ Ը ՀԱԼ
 ԱՄԱԿԱՆ ԱԿ ԱՎԱ
 ԱՎԱԿ ԳԼ ԻՐԱԾ
 ԱԽ ՀԱԼԻ ԼԱԼ
 ԱՅ ՋԱՇ ԽԱՎ
 ԼԱԼ ՏԱԼ ԱՎԱ
 ԽԵՎԱՆ ՀԱԼԿԾ
 ԽԵՎԱՆ ԻՆՀԱ
 ԹԱԽԱ ԱԽ Ա
 ԱԼԼՈ ԽԵՎ

ՀԱՅԻ :
“ ԱՎԱՍՏ ԹԵՐԵ
ԸՆԱԳՈ ԸԼԻ ԽՍՏ
ՀԵՐԵ ԾԱԾԿ ՀԱՅԻ
ԹԼԽՆ ԽԱԼ ԱՎԱՍՏ ”

Text of the Palestinian Amidah Translation

Modern version as printed in Singer (pp. 44-54)

חסד צדקה וברכה
ורחמים וחימ
ושלום וטוב בעיניך
לבך את עמך ישראל
בכל עת וככל
שעה בשלומך ברוך
אתה יי' המברך את
עמו ישראל בשלום :

Tōrāh of life, lovingkindness
and righteousness, and bles-
sing, and mercy, and life,
and peace; and may it be
good in Thy sight to bless
Thy people Israel at every
time and in every hour with
Thy peace. Blessed art
Thou, O Lord, who blessest
Thy [His] people Israel with
peace.

The dating of the Benedictions in the preceding table is that of Finkelstein (see his article in *J.Q.R.*, N.S., vol. xvi, pp. 1–43 and 127–70).

The text of the Palestinian '*Amidāh*' printed above is that of the larger fragment published by Schechter (*J.Q.R.* O.S., vol. x, pp. 656–7). There are variants in the smaller fragments which he published (*loc. cit.*), of which the following are the most important.

בָּתְהוּ בָּבָרֶךְ וְאַנְּצָרֶךְ מִשְׁבֵּת הָרוֹחַ וּמוֹרֵיד שְׁמַם מִכְלָל חַיִם מִחְיָה : וְאַنְּ כָּמוֹךְ הוּא וְלֹא תְּחִזֵּק אֶת־מִתְהִימָּה וְרַב לְהַשְׁעֵךְ בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי' מִחְיָה המִתְהִימָּה : 'Thou art mighty and there is none like Thee; strong, and there is none beside Thee; that makest the wind to blow and sendest down the rain, that sustainest the living, that quickenest the dead, and art mighty to save. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.' It is impossible to say whether this short version of the Benediction is original, or whether its emphasis on the Unity of God reflects the same heresy-hunt as Benediction No. 12 (*Birkath ha-Minim*), which was inserted in the '*Amidāh c.* A.D. 90.¹

הַשְׁיבָנוּ יי' אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹיכָן in Schechter's smaller fragment (*op. cit.*, p. 659), which introduces the important phrase 'יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ'² into the text. But no other support for this reading is forthcoming, and it may be a gloss, or simply due to assimilation.³

There are slight differences in Benedictions Nos. 8, 9, and 11, but they do not materially alter the sense.

Benediction No. 12 (*Birkath ha-Minim*) is expanded in one of Schechter's smaller fragments by the addition of an interesting phrase: 'For apostates let there be no hope <unless they return to Thy Torah> and the dominion of arrogance etc.'⁴ The addition of this clause is quite in accordance with the Rabbinic sentiment expressed, for example, in the statement that 'If a proselyte and a (penitent) apostate ask for charity, the apostate has the preference'.⁵ The object of the 'Benediction' was not to condemn irremediably

¹ *Vide supra*, pp. 3–4.

² *Vide supra*, p. 24.

³ In a letter to the present writer Dr. Finkelstein notes that the Biblical text of Lam. v. 22 (which supplies the opening words of this Benediction) does not contain the word אֱלֹהֵינוּ. He suggests that the scribe who was writing the smaller fragment began to write אֱלֹיכָן and by mistake wrote אֱלֹהֵינוּ: since it is forbidden to erase the Name of God, he could not take it out, and so it has remained.

⁴ אִם לَا יִשּׂוּבּוּ לְתוֹרַתְךָ <.

⁵ j.Hor. iii 48b (foot).

those guilty of a *lapsus fidei*, but to bring home the enormity of apostasy and idolatry.

In the text of the Palestinian Benediction No. 16 Finkelstein prints in square brackets after בֵּירוֹשָׁלָם the following phrase: [אנוּ: רחומ בְּרַחֲמֵיכֶם הָרַבִּים הַשְׁכִינַתְךָ לִצְיָון עִירְךָ וִסְדָּר הַעֲבוֹודָה לִירוֹשָׁלָם] בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהֻנָּה. The Benediction then runs: 'Accept (us), O Lord our God, and dwell in Zion; and may Thy servants serve Thee in Jerusalem. < O be merciful in Thy great mercy; and cause Thy Divine Presence to return to Zion Thy city and order the service for Jerusalem. > Blessed art Thou, O Lord, whom in reverent fear we worship.' The words between brackets do not occur in the Genizah fragments published by Schechter, but it seems likely that they formed part of the old Palestinian Benediction.¹

¹ The words were ordained by the early *Hašidim*, according to *Midrash Tehillim* on Ps. xvii. 2 (ed. Buber fol. 64a § 4); or by the early Prophets, according to *Midrash Samuel* xxxi (ed. Buber fol. 70a line 1).

GLOSSARY

'AMÔRĀ, pl. **'AMÔRĀİM**. Name given to the Talmudic Rabbis who lived after the redaction of the *Mishnāh*. They taught in Palestine and Babylonia from c. A.D. 219 to c. A.D. 500.

ANAPHORA. The term properly designates the Eucharistic Prayer, in or through which thanksgiving is offered, consecration is effected, and the oblation offered (cf. LXX ἀναφέρειν = to offer up, sacrifice). It begins, therefore, with the *sursum corda* dialogue and includes the intercession. The term was next extended to cover all from *sursum corda* to the final dismissal, and, ultimately, to cover the whole *Missa Fideliūm*, i.e. that part of the service at which baptized persons alone were present. It corresponds, accordingly, with the Roman *Canon Missae*.

ASHKENĀZĪM. The Jews of northern France, Germany, and the Slavonic-speaking countries.

AUDIENTES. Those catechumens who had not yet given in their names as applicants for baptism, but who were allowed to attend in churches and listen to the lections and homilies.

BĀRĀITĀ. A teaching of the *Tannāim* not included in the *Mishnāh*. A collection of such teachings is found in the *Tōseftā*, and many are quoted in the *Talmūd*.

CATECHUMEN. One under instruction with a view to baptism.

COMPETENTES. Those catechumens who had given in their names as applicants for baptism, and who were under final instruction during the forty days preceding Easter for baptism on Easter-eve, or at the seasons of Pentecost or Epiphany.

FIDELES. 'The faithful', i.e. baptized persons who were entitled to stay on in the churches, after the dismissal of the catechumens, for the celebration of the Eucharist.

GĀÖN, pl. **GEÖNÎM**. An official title applied to the heads of the Babylonian academies at *Šûrā* and *Pümbedîthā* from the seventh to the eleventh centuries A.D. The *Gāön* was a kind of Grand Rabbi who was consulted by letter by Jews from all over the world. Volumes of their official replies (*Responsa*) are still extant.

GENIZĀH. A room in the Synagogue set apart for storing disused or defective manuscripts of the books of the Bible, and heretical Hebrew books. The Scriptures, once written, must not be destroyed: hence worn-out copies were stored away in the *Genizāh*.

GLOSSARY

HABHDĀLĀH. A short service of prayer to mark the termination of Sabbath or festival, in which a cup of wine, spices, and light are used (see Singer, pp. 216 et seq.).

HAFTĀRĀH. Scripture lesson from the prophetical books read in the Synagogue after the lection from the Pentateuch.

HAGGADĀH. The name given to the non-juristic teaching in the Rabbinic literature, as opposed to the juristic portions (*Halākah*). It includes homiletic exposition of the Bible, folk-lore, history, legend, the aim of the whole being religious and moral instruction.

HAGIOGRAPHA. The books of the Hebrew Bible not comprised in the Law and the Prophets.

HALĀKĀH. (1) The legal sections of the *Talmūd*: the opposite of *Haggādāh*. (2) A decision arrived at after a discussion on a point of law.

HAZZĀN. The Synagogue attendant, the minister (Lk. iv. 20), who had in his charge the Synagogue building and its furniture, especially the rolls of the Scriptures. He brought the scroll during service time and delivered it to the reader; received it back when the reading was concluded (Lk. iv. 20); and read part, or even the whole, of the lesson when there were not enough readers present. He might also lead in prayer. Frequently he filled the combined office of sexton and schoolmaster.

KADDISH. Originally the doxology recited by the teacher or preacher to dismiss the assembly at the close of his discourse, and composed in Aramaic during the period after the Exile, it was introduced into the Synagogue service in pre-Christian days to mark the end of one of the principal sections of the service. It occurs in the modern Prayer Book in various forms (Singer, pp. 37, 75, 77, 86, 321).

KEDUSHSHĀH. The central portion of the Third Benediction of the '*Amidāh*', which has given its name, in popular usage, to the whole Benediction as recited aloud by the Reader with the responses in which the congregation joins. Ordinarily these responses were Is. vi. 3, Ezek. iii. 12, and Ps. cxlvii. 10. We first hear of the use of the verses in connexion with R. Judah ben Il'ai, in the middle of the second century A.D. (see Finkelstein, *J.Q.R.* (N.S.), vol. xvi, p. 31).

MA'AMAD. The name given to a group of representatives from outlying districts, corresponding to the twenty-four courses of priests. Part of them went up to the Temple to witness the offering of the sacrifices, while the others met together in their own village and held prayers at fixed times during the

day coinciding with the fixed times of sacrifice in the Temple.

MARHESHVĀN. The eighth month in the Jewish calendar, corresponding approximately to November.

MASS OF THE CATECHUMENS (*Missa Catechumenorum*). *See Pro-Anaphora.*

MASS OF THE FAITHFUL (*Missa Fidelium*). This began with the common prayers following upon the dismissal of the catechumens, and the Anaphora (in its primary sense of the great Eucharistic Prayer) was the central portion of it.

MIDRĀSH, pl. **MIDRĀSHIM**. Originally the deduction of an idea or rule from the Scriptures. It was then used in a more restricted sense to denote the *Haggadic* exegesis of the Bible, and particularly the collections of such homilies and expositions.

MISHNĀH. The corpus of legal traditions, the unwritten *Tōrah* (cf. Mk. vii. 3) explaining or supplementing the laws of the Pentateuch, in the form compiled by R. Judah the Prince c. A.D. 200.

ORDINARY OF THE MASS. The fixed framework of the service into which the variable parts, proper to the day or season, are fitted; and by popular usage it is taken to mean the whole of the Mass except the Canon.

PĀRĀSHĀH. The Scripture lesson from the Pentateuch read in the course of the Synagogue service, especially, but not exclusively, on Sabbaths.

PRO-ANAPHORA. That part of the liturgy, preceding the *Anaphora*, which catechumens were permitted to attend along with the baptized members of the Church. It ended with the dismissal of the catechumens; hence the common term *Missa Catechumenorum*.

RESPONSA. *See Geōnim.*

SANCTUS. The Seraphic hymn, being Is. vi. 3 with certain modifications and additions (e.g. in all rites but the Egyptian *Benedictus qui venit* (Mt. xxi. 9) is appended), which concludes that part of the Canon or *Anaphora* known in the West as the *Preface*. The Seraphic hymn is sometimes also called the *Trisagion*, the *Epinikion* or *Triumphal* hymn, the *Angelic* hymn, and the *Ter-Sanctus*.

SYNAxis (Gk. σύναξις = assembly). A general term for a meeting of the Church for an act of common worship, inclusive of the Eucharist.

TALMŪD. The name given to that branch of Rabbinic literature which comprises the *Mishnāh* and the discussions (*Gemārā*, lit.

GLOSSARY

completion) on the *Mishnāh* by Palestinian and Babylonian scholars from the third to the fifth century A.D. The 'Jerusalem Talmud' represents the tradition of the Palestinian scholars, and it was redacted before the 'Babylonian Talmud'.

TANNAIM (pl. of *Tannā*). Title given to those Rabbis whose teachings are contained in the *Mishnāh* and *Bārāitā*.

TÖRÄH (lit. instruction). (1) The Pentateuch, as distinct from the prophetical books. (2) The term is used in a wide sense to denote the whole body of Jewish teaching as contained in the Scriptures and the Rabbinical interpretation thereof. It does not mean 'Law', in any juristic sense, but rather a way of life based upon Revealed Religion.

TÖSEFTÄ. The work known by this name consists of a collection of *halākōth* parallel to the official *Mishnāh*, but the *barāitōth* treat in a more complete form than does the *Mishnāh* the subject of traditional law. The *Haggādic* element is also much more pronounced in the *Töseftä* than in the *Mishnāh*.

TRISAGION. The name is properly applied to a hymn sung in the Eastern liturgies in the Mass of the Catechumens (the Pro-Anaphora), apparently of fifth century origin. It runs thus, in its simplest form: "Αγιος ὁ Θεός, "Αγιος Ἰσχυρος, "Αγιος Ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς ('Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us'). It is also applied sometimes to the Seraphic hymn, or *Sanctus* (q.v.), whose proper Greek name is *Epinikion* (ὁ ἐπινίκιος ὕμνος).

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, ed. W. Smith and S. Cheetham.
1908. Arts. 'Sabbath', 'Divine Office', 'Hours of Prayer', &c.

ABRAHAMS, Israel. *A Companion to the Authorised Daily Prayer Book*.
(Revised ed. London 1922.)

Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd Series, especially his
essay on 'The Lord's Prayer'. (Cambridge 1924.)

BATIFFOL, P. *History of the Roman Breviary*, tr. by A. M. Y. Baylay
from the 3rd French edition. (London 1912.)

BLAU, Ludwig. 'Origine et histoire de la lecture du Schema', in
R.E.J., vol. xxxi (1895), pp. 181-201.
Art. 'Liturgy', in *J.E.*, vol. viii, pp. 132-40.

BONDI, J. *Der Siddur des Rabbi Saadia Gaon*. (Frankfurt a. M.
1904.)

BRIGHTMAN, F. E. *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Vol. i, Eastern.
(Oxford 1896.)
Art. on 'The Sacramentary of Sarapion', in *J.T.S.*, vol. i (1899).

BÜCHLER, A. *Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des
jerusalemischen Tempels*. (Wien 1895.)
Art. on 'The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial
Cycle', in *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. v, pp. 420-68.

CABROL, F. *The Mass of the Western Rites*. (London 1934.)

CABROL, F., and H. LECLERCQ. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne
et de liturgie*. (Paris 1907- .) Various arts., esp. on 'Amen',
'Baptême', &c.

Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica. Vol. i. (Paris 1900.)

CHASE, F. H. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, in *Texts and
Studies* (vol. i. iii), ed. J. Armitage Robinson. (Cambridge
1891.)

CLEMEN, Carl. *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*.
(Eng. tr. 1912.)

CONNOLLY, R. H. *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived
Documents*, in *Texts and Studies* (vol. viii. iv), ed. J. Armitage
Robinson. (Cambridge 1916.)
Didascalia Apostolorum. (Oxford 1929.)

COOPER, J., and A. J. MACLEAN. *The Testament of Our Lord*. (Edin-
burgh 1902.)

DIX, G. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of S. Hippolytus of
Rome*, vol. i. (London 1937.)

DUCHESNE, L. *Christian Worship: its Origin and Evolution*. (5th ed.
London 1923.)

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

EASTON, B. S. *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, trans. into English. (Cambridge 1934.)

EISENSTEIN, J. D. Art. *Shema'* in *J.E.*, vol. xi, pp. 266-7.

ELBOGEN, I. *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. 3rd ed. (Frankfurt am Main 1931.)
Art. in *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. lv, pp. 426-46, 586-99.

FINKELSTEIN, L. 'The Development of the 'Amidah', in *J.Q.R.* (New Series), vol. xvi, pp. 1-43, 127-70.

'La Kedouscha et les Bénédictions du Schema', in *R.E.J.*, vol. xciii (1932), pp. 1-26.

FORTESCUE, A. *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*. (London 1937.)

FRERE, W. H. *The Anaphora or great Eucharistic Prayer*. (London 1938.)

FRUMKIN, Ed. *Seder Rab 'Amram*. (Jerusalem 1912.)

GAVIN, F. *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*. (London 1928.)

GINZBERG, Louis. *Geonica*. Vol. i, The Geonim and their Halakic writings. Vol. ii, Genizah Studies. (New York 1909.)

HASTINGS, J. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Various articles, especially that on the 'Synagogue' by Bacher.

HEFELE, C. J. von. *Histoire des Conciles*. Trad. franç. par H. Leclercq. Ed. 2. (Paris 1907- .)

HERFORD, R. Travers. *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. (London 1903.)
Talmud and Apocrypha. (London 1933.)

HERTZ, J. H. *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire*. Revised edition with commentary. Part I. (London 1942.)

HOLTZMANN, H. J. Art. 'Die täglichen Gebetsstunden im Judentum und Urchristentum', in *Z.N.T.W.* (1911), p. 90.

HORNER, G. *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici*. Ed. and trans. (London 1904.)

IDELSOHN, A. Z. *Jewish Liturgy and its Development*. (New York 1932.)

JACKSON, FOAKES, and KIRSOOP LAKE. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vols. i-v. (London 1920-33.)

JAMES, M. R. *The Apocryphal New Testament*. (Oxford 1924.)

KOHLER, K. 'The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions', in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. i, pp. 387-425. (Cincinnati 1924.)

Art. 'Reading from the Law', in *J.E.*, vol. vii, p. 647.

Art. 'Didascalia', in *J.E.*, vol. iv, pp. 588-94.

The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. Ed. H. G. Enelow. (New York 1929.)

KRAEMER, C. J. Art. 'Pliny and the Early Church Service', in *Journal of Classical Philology*, vol. xxix (1934).

LAKE, Kirsopp. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. (London 1911.)

LÉVI, Israel. 'Fragments de Rituels de Prières provenant de la Gueniza du Caire', in *R.E.J.*, vol. liii (1907), pp. 231-41.

'Les Dix-huit Bénédictions et les Psaumes de Salomon', in *R.E.J.*, vol. xxxii (1896), pp. 161-78.

LIETZMANN, H. Essay on 'The Christian Church in the West', in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xii, chap. xv.

MANN, Jacob. 'Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service', in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. ii, pp. 269-338. (Cincinnati 1925.)

'Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecutions', in *H.U.C.A.*, vol. iv, pp. 241-310. (Cincinnati 1927.)

The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, of which vol. i has appeared. (Cincinnati 1940.)

MAXWELL, W. D. *An Outline of Christian Worship*. (Oxford 1936.)

MICKLEM, Nathaniel, Ed. *Christian Worship*. (Oxford 1936.)

MOORE, G. F. *Judaism*. Vols. i-iii. (Cambridge 1927-30.)

OESTERLEY, W. O. E. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*. (Oxford 1925.)

OESTERLEY, W. O. E., and G. H. Box. *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*. 2nd ed. (London 1911.)

PARKES, James. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*. (London 1934.)

PROBST, F. *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte*. (Tübingen 1870.)

RAHMANI, I. *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*. (Mainz 1899.)

RATCLIFF, E. C. Essay on 'Christian Worship and Liturgy', in *The Study of Theology*, ed. K. E. Kirk. (London 1939.)

SCHECHTER, A. I. *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* (Seder Hibbur Berakoth). (Philadelphia 1930.)

SCHECHTER, S. 'Geniza (Cairo) MSS.: Liturgy', in *J.Q.R.* (Old Series), vol. x (1898), pp. 654-9.

SCHONFIELD, H. J. *The History of Jewish Christianity from the first to the twentieth Century*. (London 1936.)

SCHÜRER, E. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. (Eng. tr., T. & T. Clark, n.d.)

SINGER, S., Ed. *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire.* 14th ed. (London 1929.)

SNAPE, R. H. Essay on 'Rabbinical and Early Christian Ethics', in *A Rabbinic Anthology*, ed. C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe. (London 1938.)

SRAWLEY, J. H. *The Early History of the Liturgy.* (Cambridge 1913.)

THACKERAY, H. St. J. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920).

VOKES, F. E. *The Riddle of the Didache.* (London 1938.)

WARREN, F. E. *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church.* (London 1912.)

WOOLLEY, R. M. *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church.* (Cambridge 1910.)

ZEITLIN, S. *An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures.* (Philadelphia 1933.)

ZUNZ, Leopold. *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt.* Ed. 2. (Frankfurt am Main 1892.)

INDEX I

BIBLICAL REFERENCES

Genesis iv. 3-8	71	xx. 3	67
Exodus xxi. 13	30	xx. 5	67
xxix. 38-42	59	Mk. i. 21	1
xxix. 39	59	i. 39	1
xxx. 8	59	ii. 18	37
Leviticus vi. 20	59	iii. 1	1
xxiii. 5	59	vi. 2	1
xxiii. 44	13	Lk. i	75
Numbers xv. 37-41	17, 18, 20	i. 51	76
xxii. 2-xxiv. 5	19	i. 54	76
xxiii. 24	87	iv. 15	1
xxviii. 1-8	59	iv. 16	1, 14
xxxii. 3	72	iv. 17	103
Deuteronomy vi. 4-9	18	iv. 44	1
vi. 4	18	v. 33	37
vi. 7	17	vi. 6	1
xi. 13-21	18, 20	xiii. 10-17	1
xxxiii. 4	19	xviii. 12	37
Ezra ix. 4, 5	65	xxiii. 44	65
Nehemiah viii. 8	19	Jn. vi. 59	1
viii. 18	19	vi. 03	87
ix. 5	12	viii. 34	36
Psalms i. 16-23	71	xviii. 20	1
iv. 4	72	Acts i. 14	7
v. 2	47	ii. 15	64
vi. 6	97	ii. 42	8
lv. 18	62	ii. 46	7
xc	69	iii. 1	7, 62, 65
cxiii-cxviii	15, 109	iii. 5	xi
cxix	69	iv. 2	7
cxix. 62	68	v. 21	7
cxix. 164	62	v. 25	7
xxxxvi	15, 109	v. 42	7
Isaiah l. 13-14	48	vi. 9	7, 18
liii	71	ix. 2	7
liii. 5	87	ix. 20	7
Lamentations v. 22	126	x. 3	62
Ezekiel xx. 12	30	x. 9	62, 65
Daniel vi. 10	65	x. 30	62
ix. 21	65	xii. 5	71
Wisdom of Solomon i. 1	vii	xii. 12	71
Ecclesiasticus xlv. 25	12	xiii. 3	71
l. 22	12	xiii. 5	1
1 Maccabees vii. 33	79	xiii. 14	1, 7
Mt. iv. 23	1	xiv. 1	1
vi. 11	57, 95	xiv. 23	71
ix. 14	37	xvi. 25	68
ix. 35	1	xvii. 2	1
xii. 9	1	xvii. 10	1, 7
xiii. 54	1	xvii. 11	71
		xvii. 17	1
		xviii. 4	1

INDEX I

Acts xviii. 19	1	xvi. 2	26
xix. 8	1, 7	Gal. iv. 10	28
xx. 7	8, 9, 26	Eph. v. 19	8, 71, 80	
xx. 11	8	vi. 14	8, 80	
xx. 36	71	Phil. i. 27	8, 80	
xxiv. 14	1	iv. 6	71	
xxvii. 35	8	Col. ii. 16	28	
Rom. vii. 14	29	ii. 17	28	
1 Cor. x. 16	8	iii. 16	.	.	.	8, 71, 80		
xi. 4	71	1 Thess. v. 17	46	
xi. 6	8	v. 27	8	
xi. 7	8	1 Tim. ii. 1	8, 71	
xi. 20-9	9	ii. 8	8, 80	
xiv. 13	71	iv. 1	33	
xiv. 16	8	iv. 13	8	
xiv. 26	80	Heb. iv. 9	31	
xv. 51, 52	78	Rev. xix. 6	109	

INDEX II

PATRISTIC LITERATURE

This index includes the Apocryphal N.T., the Fathers, Josephus, Philo, Greek and Latin authors, and Canons of Church Councils.

<i>Acts of John</i> , xcvi	26
<i>Acts of Paul</i> , x	109
<i>Acts of Peter, Vercelli Acts</i> , ix	5
xv	31
xvi	31
xviii	31
xxx	31
xxxii	31
<i>Acts of Philip</i> , ix.	102
<i>Acts of Pilate</i> , xv.	6
<i>Acts of Thomas</i> , 82-5	104
Ambrose	89
<i>De Myst.</i> i. 1	95
<i>Ep.</i> xx. 3	95
xx. 4	95
xx. 15	56
xxi. 34	99
xxii. 3	95
xxii. 14	95
Ambrosiaster	
<i>De Sacramentis</i> v. iv.	25
VI. v.	56
<i>Apocalypse of Paul</i> , vii	22
xxi	70
xxix	50
xl	109
Aristides	
<i>Apolog.</i> xv	97, 109
Arnobius	
<i>Adv. Gent.</i> I. xxxvi	39
IV. xxxvi	50
<i>Assumption of the Virgin</i> , x	82
xxxvii	85, 86
xxxviii	26
Athanasius	
<i>Apolog. contra Arian.</i> § 11	26
<i>Apolog. de fuga sua</i> , § 24	41, 97, 98
<i>Epist. Heortastic.</i> vi. 13	32
<i>Hist. Arian.</i> § 55	41
§ 81	98
Augustine	
<i>Confess.</i> v. ix. (§ 17)	50
IX. viii. (§ 15)	99
x. xxxiii. (§ 50)	99
<i>De Catechiz. Rudibus</i> , xiii. (§ 18)	96
xiii. (§ 19)	96
<i>De Fide et Op.</i> vi. 9	91
<i>De Serm. Dom. in Monte</i> , II. vii. 25	57
II. vii. 26	56

PATRISTIC LITERATURE

141

x Clement	lix-lxi	23, 107
	lix. 3	76
	lxiv	78
Clement of Alexandria		
Paedagog.	ii. iv	46
Strom.	vi. xvi	104
	vii. vii	67, 85
	vii. xii	40
Commodianus		
Instruc.	ii. xxvi, line 9	84
Const. Apost.	ii. lvii	97
	v. xx	39
	vii. xxiii. 2	32
	vii. xxxvi. 1, 2	32
	viii. xxxii. 1	32
	viii. xxxii. 16	91
Cyprian		
De Lapsis,	xxv	55
De Orat. Domin.	viii	49
	xviii	56
	xxxiv	66, 67
	xxxv	47, 67
De Unit. Eccles.	xvii	40
Ep. i. 16	.	85
	vii. 7	49
	xxiv	84
	xxxiii. 2-3	84
	xxxiv. 4	83
	liv. 3	55
	lvi. 1	56
	lxiii. 16	56
Cyril of Jerusalem		
Catech.	iv. xxxvi	90
Catech. Mystagog.	i-v	91
	v	82
	v. xi	68
Procat.	iv	90
Didache, i, ii	.	104
	viii. 1	32, 38
	viii. 3	60, 68
	xiv. 1	27
Didascalia Apostolorum,	xxi	39
Epiphanius		
Adv. Haer. (Panarion),	xxix. 9	3, 62
	xxx. 18	5
Expos. Fid.	xxiv	35
Eusebius		
De Mart. Palest.	xiii. 7	87
	xiii. 8	87
Hist. Eccl.	ii. xvii. 22	81
	ii. xxiii. 6	86
	iii. iii. 2	87
	iii. iii. 6	87
	iii. xvi	87
	iii. xxv. 4	87
	iv. v. 1-2	4
	iv. vi. 4	5
	iv. xxiii. 3	73

INDEX II

Eusebius

Hist. Eccl. iv. xxix. 5

V. v. 1	73
V. x. 1	83
V. xii. 1	88
V. xxviii. 5	5
VI. vi. 1	85
VI. viii. 1	88
VI. xii. 1	88
VI. xix. 16	87
VI. xlvi. 11	89
VII. xxxii. 3	84
VII. xxxii. 27	88
VIII. vi. 9	88
X. i. 1	84
X. iv. 72	109

Gospel of Bartholomew, ii. 6

ii. 13

89
86

109

Gregory of Nyssa

De Castig. ii

36

Hermas

Simil. v. 1

40

v. 3

39

Hippolytus

Ap. Trad. xvii

91

xxiv. 1

33

xxv. 1

38

xxvi. 18-32

46

xxxii. 1, 2

45

xxxii. 1

45

xxxiii. 2

45

xxxv. 1, 2

45

xxxvi. 1

45

xxxvi. 2-6

66, 67

xxxvi. 4

65

xxxvi. 7

45

xxxvi. 8

68

xxxvi. 14

68

Com. in Dan. iv. 20

33

Ignatius

Ad Ephes. v. 1

52

x. 1

79

Ad Magnes. vii. 1, 2

52

ix. 1

27, 29

Ad Philad. vi. 1

6

ix.

72

Ad Smyrn. vii

72

Ad Trall. iii. 1

72

Irenaeus

Adv. Haer. i. xxvi. 2

72

i. xxx. 5-10

74

ii. xxiv. 3

73

ii. xxvii. 2

73

ii. xxviii. 3

109

iii. iii. 1

5

iii. vi. 1

5

iii. xi. 8

5

iii. xi. 9

72

72

Irenaeus

<i>Adv. Haer.</i> iv. xiii. 4	30
iv. xv. 1	30, 104
iv. xv. 2	30
iv. xvi. 1	30
iv. xxiii. 8	73
iv. xxvi. 3	5

Jerome

<i>Adv. Vigilant.</i> vii	94
<i>De Vir. Ill.</i> lxxvi	88
<i>Dialog. contra Lucif.</i> viii	100
<i>Ep.</i> xxii. 37	46, 69
lvi. 8	93
lxxi. 6	58
cvii. 9	69
cviii. 20	69
cviii. 30	97
cxxxii.	37
cxxx. 15	69
<i>In Isaiam</i> , v. 18	3
xlix. 7	3
lvi. 4	3
lviii	37

Josephus

<i>Ant.</i> iv. viii. 13	17
xiv. iv. 3	63
<i>Bell. Jud.</i> II. x. 4	79
<i>Contr. Apion.</i> II. viii (§ 105)	63
II. ix (§ 119)	63
<i>Vita</i> , liv (§ 279)	14

Justin Martyr

<i>Apol.</i> I. lxvii	27, 72
<i>Dialog. c. Tryph.</i> xvi	3
xviii	29
xlvii	4
lxxi-lxxiii	72

Lactantius

<i>Dio. Inst.</i> IV. xxviii	50
VI. xxv	85
<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i> , xiv	74

Origen

<i>Comment. in Epist. ad Rom.</i> ix. 1	46
<i>De Orat.</i> xii	46, 60, 66, 67,	68
xxxii	49,	86
xxxii	85	
<i>Hom. in Gen.</i> x. 1	49
x. 2	49
x. 3	48, 49,	86
<i>Hom. in Exod.</i> i. 1	88
iii. 3	86
vii. 5	88
vii. 8	48
viii.	104
xi. 7	85
xii. 2	48,	88
xiii. 3	48,	87, 88
<i>Hom. in Levit.</i> x. 2	40
<i>Hom. in Num.</i> v. 1	83

INDEX III

RABBINIC REFERENCES

b. 'Abodah Zarah 8a	117	b. Rosh Hash-shanah 32a	109
b. 'Arak. 10a	15	b. Sanh. 35a	39
b. Baba Kamma 82a	13	Sot. vii. 1	18
Ber. i. 1-2	17	j. Sot. vii. 1. 21b	18
i. 2	53, 63	b. Shuk. 42a	19
i. 3	17	53a	63
i. 4	20	Ta'an. i. 1	115
ii. 5	18	i. 3	37
v. 1	118	ii. 9	37
v. 2	115	iv. 2	16
vii. 3	12	b. Ta'an. 15b	16
ix. 5	79	16a	37
b. Ber. 6b	39	27a	16
8a	72	27b	16, 105
12a	21, 29, 105	28b	15
12b	19	Tamid iii. 2	59
13b	19	v. 1	21
26b	15, 62, 63	b. Yom. 69a	79
27b	64		
28b	119	<i>Aboth de-R. Nathan</i> i. 8, fol. 3a	32
29a	123	<i>Masseketh Sopherim</i> x. 1	13
29b	122	Targ. Jon.	
33a	23	on Exod. xxix. 39	59
57b	32	Targ. Onk.	
60b	12	on Exod. xxix. 39	59
j. Ber. i. 8. 3c	19, 21, 29, 105		
iv. 1. 7b	15	Maimonides	
iv. 2. 7d	79	<i>Hilkoth Keriat Shema'</i> i. 2	18
Tos. Ber. i. 4	17	<i>Mekilta</i> , on Exod. xv. 22	13
j. Hor. iii. 48b	126	<i>Midrash Samuel</i> xxxi	127
Meg. iii. 6	13	<i>Midrash Tanhuma</i>	
iv. 1	13	<i>Bereshit</i> § 7 (Buber, fol. 3a)	105
b. Meg. 17b	23, 116-20	<i>Midrash Tehillim</i>	
18a	121, 122, 124	on Ps. xvii. 2	127
31b	13	<i>Pirké de-R. Eliézer</i>	
j. Meg. iv. 1. 75a	13	(Friedlander, p. 124)	26
Tos. Meg. iv. 10	13	(Friedlander, p. 359)	26
b. Men. 99b	17	Rashi	
Pešahim v. 1	60, 63	on b. Ber. 8a-8b	72
b. Pes. 56a	103	<i>Sifré</i> i. 66	19
Rosh Hash-shanah iv. 5	114, 115		

INDEX IV

SUBJECTS AND NAMES

Abrahams, Israel, 3
 Achelis, H., 52
 'Adōn 'Olām, 12
 Afternoon service, Synagogue. See *Minhāh*
 'Ahabāh, 20, 75, 77, 106 n.1
 'Akiba, Rabbi, 12, 17, 23
 Alexandria, 35, 41-2, 46, 48, 49, 51, 67, 88-9, 112
 Almemar, 84
 Ambo, 83
 Ambrose, 90, 95, 98-9
 Amen, 8, 27, 109
 'Amīdāh, 3, 4, 12-13, 16, 18, 22-5, 60-1, 63, 64, 74-9, 102-3, 107-10, 114-27; seven-word formula in the, 24. See also Benedictions, the Eighteen (for refs. to individual benedictions)
 Ammi, Rabbi, 72 n.1
 Anaphora, the, 6, 9, 10, 54, 83, 92, 95, 108, 110, 112
 Antioch, 44, 51-5, 88, 97
 Anti-Semitism, 6, 27, 29-30, 36, 37, 44, 72 n.3, 103
Apocalypse of Paul, 50
Apocalypse of Peter, 87 n.6
 Apostles, memoirs of the, 27, 72
Apostolic Church Order, 30 n.5, 92
Apostolic Constitutions, 34, 97
Apostolic Tradition. See Hippolytus
 'Arbīth, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 60-4
 Aristides, *Apology* of, 44
 Arnobius, 50
 Ashkenazic use, 11 n.2, 76
 Asia Minor, 30-1, 34, 52
 Athanasius, 41-2, 90, 98-9
Audientes, 91
 Augustine, 33, 36-7, 50, 56-7, 90, 93, 95-6, 98-100
 Bar Cochba, 4, 24, 103
Barnabas, Epistle of, 6, 29, 44, 71
 Basil, 69, 90
 Batiffol, Mgr. P., 51, 70
 Benedict, 70
 Benedictions, Eighteen: No. 1. 76, 107; No. 2. 74, 76, 78, 107, 126; No. 3. 77, 102-3, 108; No. 4. 77, 107; No. 5. 126; No. 12. 3, 76, 79 and n.6, 105, 126; No. 16. 127; No. 17. 23, 107; No. 18. 62 n.1, 107. See also *Amīdāh*
 Benedictions, *Shema'*, 20-1, 53, 63, 64, 105-7
 Benedictus, 75-6
Bēth ha-Midrāsh, 2, 44, 63, 91
 Bethlehem, monks of, 69
 Bindley, T. H., 83 n.9
 Blau, Ludwig, 19, 20
 Brightman, F. E., 35, 112
 Buber, S., 14 n.5
 Cabrol, F., 10, 75, 76, 111
 Caesarea, 18, 44, 88-9
 Canon, of the Mass. See Anaphora — of Scripture, 72-3, 90
 Canonical Hours, 6, 50-1, 58, 59-70, 112. See also Cock-crow, compline, lauds, midnight, none, prime, sext, terce, vespers
 'Canons of Hippolytus', 34
 Cassian, John, 69
 Cassiodorus, 70
 Catechumens, 68 n.2, 83, 86, 96; dismissal of the, 54, 92, 95; 'house' of the, 91-2; instruction of the, 83, 88, 90-2; Mass of the. See Pro-Anaphora
 See also *audientes*, *competentes*
 Chrysostom, 46, 51-2, 54-5, 58 n.1, 68 n.2, 90, 92, 93, 97-8
 Clement of Alexandria, 40, 46, 67, 88, 104
 Clement of Rome, 38, 43, 71, 74, 75, 76, 87 n.6, 106 n.1, 107-8; so-called Second Epistle of, 74
 Cock-crow, prayer at, 68-9
Competentes, the, 57, 91, 95, 100
Completorium. See *Compline*
Compline, 69-70
 Connolly, Dom R. H., 30 n.5, 33 n.8, 34, 38 n.4, 52
 Cooper, J., and Maclean, A. J., 35, 53, 54
 Cornelius, bp. of Rome, 84
 Creed, J. M., 38 n.4
 Creed, the Jewish, 16, 17 n.1
 Cyprian, 6, 9, 40, 47, 49, 55-6, 66, 67, 84, 85, 100
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 68 n.2, 90, 108
 Daily services, non-eucharistic, 42-58, 60-70, 82, 85-8, 91-3, 95-7, 99, 102, 110, 112
 Daniel, 65

Dawn, Hymn of Praise for the, 52-4, 106-7; prayer at, among Christians, 44-5, 47, 50-2, 54, 60, 61, 67-9, 82, 85, 94, 106-7, 112; among Jews, 53, 106. See also *Shaharit*

Decalogue, 20, 21-2, 26, 64; use by early Christians, 22, 29-30, 104-5, 110

Didache, the, 30, 32, 38, 60, 61, 68, 75, 76, 87 n.6, 104; date of, 27, 38 n.4

Didascalia, 107

Dix, Dom G., 33-4, 38 n.4

Dorotheus, 88

Drews, P., 61

Easter, 83, 87 n.6

Easter eve. See Sabbath, the Great Ecclesiastical Canons. See *Apostolic Church Order*

Egypt, Church in, 34, 35 and n. 3, 56 n.9, 68, 85-9, 100; Palestinian Synagogue ritual in, 21, 22

Egyptian Church Order, 30 n.5, 33-4, 52-3

Elbogen, I., 23 n.4

'Emeth we-Yatsib, 20, 74 n.8

Epiphanius, 5, 35, 62

Eucharist, 8-11, 26-8, 33-7, 42, 48, 53, 55, 85, 86, 88, 90-2, 94-6, 110-12; daily, 6, 9, 31 n.2, 45, 53, 55-8, 68 n.2, 92-5, 112; on station days, 40-2, 94; origin of the, vi, 6

Eusebius, 4, 87 and n.6, 88 n.12, 94, 97

Eustochium, 69

Evening, prayer in the, among Christians, 45-7, 50-1, 60, 61, 67, 68, 85, 97, 112. See also *Compline*, *Vespers*

Evening service, Synagogue. See 'Arbith

Ezra, 13-15, 19

Fabius, bp. of Antioch, 84

Fast days, fasting, 31-4, 37-42, 53, 54, 82, 83, 105

Festal days, 29-33, 37, 41, 48, 49, 71, 82, 86, 110

Fideles, the, 57, 68 n.2, 91, 96, 100

Finkelstein, L., 4 n.1, 21 n.2 and n.5, 24, 102 n.1, 126-7

Friday, 32, 33, 38-42, 112

Funk, F. X., 52

Gamaliel II, Rabban, 3, 17, 23, 64

Genesis Rabbah, 14 n.5

Genizah (at Fustat), 4, 20, 21, 22, 24, 127

Geullâh, 20, 106 n.1

Ginzberg, L., 21 n.2, 102 n.1

Going-out of Sabbath. See *Habhdâl*

Gospel of Peter, 87 n.6

Gospis, 72-3, 84, 87, 92. See also Matthew, Luke, John

Grace before and after meals, 11

Great Assembly. See Great Synagogue

Great Sabbath, the. See Sabbath

Great Synagogue, men of the, 13 n.2, 23

Greek, reading the Scriptures in, 71, 93-4; recitation of the *Shema* in, 18

Gregory of Nazianzus, 93

Habhdâl, 11

Haftârâh, 13, 14, 95, 103

Haggâdâh, Christian, 26, 30, 31, 74, 104

Hallâl, 14-15, 109

Hallelujâh, 80 n.5, 85, 109

Harnack, A. von, 60-1

Heretics. See *Minim*

Herford, Travers, 13 n.2

Hermas, 39, 87 n.6

Hillâl, school of, 17

Hippolytus, vii, 33-5, 38, 44-5, 52, 61, 66, 67, 74, 106, 108

Holtzmann, H. J., 61-2, 63

Holy Saturday. See Sabbath, the Great

Holy Week, 31

Homily, homilies, 14, 26, 31, 41, 42, 48, 51, 54-5, 57, 70-2, 74, 81, 84, 87-9, 91-5, 99, 102, 104, 110, 112; applause at, 93; sitting for, 96; standing for, 93, 96

Hours of Prayer, monastic. See Canonical Hours

Huna b. Judah, Rab, 72 n.1

Hymns, 8, 9, 52, 54, 61, 71, 80, 85, 98-9

Ignatius, 5, 6, 27, 29, 51-2, 54, 71, 79, 97

Inauguration of Sabbath, 11

Inge, W. R., vi-vii

Instruction, 8, 11, 26, 36, 45, 48, 53, 55, 71, 81, 88, 89, 112

Irenaeus, 5, 30, 38, 45, 73, 74, 104

Ishmael, Rabbi, 12

James, M. R., 31 n.1, 50

Jerome, 3, 46, 58 n.1, 69, 90, 92

Jerusalem, 7, 16, 18, 44, 61, 103
 Jerusalem Church, the, 1, 4-5, 7,
 50-1, 89, 106
 Jesus, 6, 7, 10, 14, 37, 49, 103, 108;
 acceptance of, as Messiah, 1, 2;
 attitude of, towards the Sabbath,
 vi, 28; presence of, in the Syna-
 gogue, 1, 25, 89, 103
 Jewish-Christians, 1, 2-5, 29-30, 38,
 43-4, 61, 71-2, 76, 103, 107
 Jews, Judaism, 2, 5, 16, 17, 27, 29,
 30, 31, 34, 37, 40 n.4, 43, 44, 48,
 59-62, 71, 72, 79 and n.6, 80, 103
 Johanan, Rabbi, 15, 105
 John the Baptist, 37
 John, St., 26, 65; Gospel of, 72
 Josephus, 13, 17, 63, 79
 Joshua b. Hananiah, Rabbi, 23, 62
 Judah ben Il'ai, Rabbi, 13, 130
 Justin Martyr, 3, 4 n.3, 27, 29, 38,
 72-3, 79, 112
Kaddish, 12, 109-10
Kawwānāh, 19
Kedushshāh. *See* Benedictions, the
 Eighteen (Benediction No. 3)
Kidush, 11
 Kohler, K., 23 n.4
 Labourers and vineyard, parable of,
 67
 Lactantius, 50
Lamentations Rabbathi, 14 n.5
 Last Supper. *See* Eucharist
Lauds, 51, 58, 70
 Law, the. *See* *Tōrah*
 — Synagogue lection from. *See*
Pārāshāh
 Lectures, 8, 9, 13, 18-19, 27, 31, 39,
 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 51, 54, 55, 70,
 71-3, 81, 83-4, 86-8, 90-6, 99,
 102, 110-12
Lector. *See* Reader
 Lent, 32, 91, 95
 Leontius, bp. of Antioch, 97
 Levi bar Haita, Rabbi, 18
 Lévi, Israel, 23, 24
Leviticus Rabbah, 14 n.5
 Lietzmann, H., 10, 111
 Lightfoot, J. B., 97
 Lighting of the lamps. *See* *Lucerna-
 riūm*
 Liturgy. *See* Eucharist, Synagogue
 Lord's Day, the. *See* Sunday
 Lord's Prayer, the, 49, 56-7, 60-1,
 66, 68 and n.2, 70, 100, 110
Lucernarium, 46 n.2, 50-1
 Luke, Gospel of St., 72 n.6, 75-6

Ma'amad, 16, 22, 43, 60
Magnificat, 75-6
 Maimonides, 12 n.1, 17, 18
 Marcion, 72 and n.6
 Maret, R. R., v
 Martyrs, anniversaries of, 41, 42, 92,
 94
 Marx, A., 4 n.1
 Matthew, Gospel of St., 72
 Meir, Rabbi, 13, 19
 Menahem, Rabbi, 72 n.1
 Middleton, R. D., 38 n.4
 Midnight, prayer at, 69
Minhāh, 11, 13, 60-2, 64, 65
Minim, 2, 21, 79 n.6, 105
Minyan, 7, 43
Missa Catechumenorum. *See* Pro-
 Anaphora
Missa Fidelium. *See* Anaphora, Eu-
 charist
 Monday, 37-9, 42, 71; reading of
Tōrah on, 13
 Montanism, Montanists, 33, 38 and
 n.4, 72
 Moore, G. F., 14 n.5
 Morning service, Synagogue. *See*
Shaharīth
Muṣafīn, 15-16, 62

Nash Papyrus, 22
 'Nazareens', 3, 79 n.6, 105
 Nazareth, 25, 89, 103
 New Moon, 16, 19, 48
Nocturn, 51
Nocturnae convocationes, 41
None, 46-7, 60-2, 64-9
 North Africa, the Church in, 49-50,
 55-8, 68, 83-5
Nōtzerim. *See* 'Nazareens'
 Nunc Dimittis, 75
 Oesterley, W. O. E., 75-7, 106 n.1,
 108 n.6
 Optatus, 84
 Ordinary of the Mass. *See* Pro-
 Anaphora
 Origen, 31, 34, 35, 40, 46, 48-9, 51,
 52, 55 n.1, 60, 66-8, 85-7, 88, 95,
 104
 Palestinian use, Synagogue worship
 according to the, 21, 44 n.1, 76-9,
 102-3, 106 n.3, 114-27
 Pantaenus, 88
Pārāshāh, 13, 14, 18-19, 72 n.1, 86-7
 Parkes, James, 3
 Paul, St., 2, 7, 9, 10, 25, 28, 29, 46,
 68, 72, 78, 92, 103

INDEX IV

Paulinus, bp. of Tyre, 88 n.12
 Pedat, Rabbi, 79
 Pentateuchal lesson. See *Pārāshāh*
 Pentecost. See Whitsun
Peregrinatio Etheriae, 50 n.6, 51, 94, 106
Pesikta de-Rab Kahana, 14 and n.5
 Peter, St., 64-5
 Pharisees, 1, 24, 37, 64
 Philo, 81 n.3, 97
 Pierius, 88
Piyūtīm, 11
 Pliny, 9, 22, 27, 104
 Polycarp, 71, 78, 79
 Prayer, prayers, 8, 9, 11, 13, 22-3,
 27, 31, 42-9, 53-5, 60-71, 74-86,
 91-2, 94, 99-102, 107-10, 112;
 attitude of Christians at, 8, 27, 80,
 82-3, 85, 86, 99-100
 Prayer Book, Jewish, 11-12, 75, 76,
 105, 112; Christian, 90, 100, 104,
 112
Prime, 69
 Pro-Anaphora, vi n.2, 8-10, 28, 35,
 42, 54, 56-8, 68 n.2, 70-112
 Prophetical lesson. See *Haftārah*
 Prophets, writings of the, 27, 72, 73
 Psalms, antiphonal singing of, 97-9;
 responsive singing of. See *Psalmus Responsorius*; sung standing, 99;
 use of, in the Church, 8, 42, 54,
 66, 69-71, 74, 80-5, 91-2, 94, 96-
 9, 102, 110, 112; in the Syna-
 gogue, 11, 12, 14-15, 80, 97, 99,
 110
Psalmus Responsorius, 97-9
 Pulpitum, 83, 92
 Rab, 103
 Raba, 19
 Reader, function of, in the Church,
 27, 73, 83-4, 92, 98; in the Syna-
 gogue, 22, 109
 Readings, Scripture. See Lections
 Reserved sacrament, 45, 55
 Resh Lakish (Simeon b. Lakish),
 105 n.6.
 Robinson, J. A., 38 n.4
 Roman day, divisions of the, 66-7
 Romans, the, 2, 20, 102-3
 Rome, 5, 33-5, 42, 44, 49, 58 and
 n.1, 68, 84, 85, 88, 107, 112
 Sa'adiah, Rabbi, 17 n.1, 106 n.3
 Sabbath, Christian observance of
 the, 28-37, 41, 42, 53, 54, 58 n.2,
 82, 92, 94-5, 111; contrasted with
 the Jewish observance of Sabbath,
 31-2, 36; in Judaism, vi, 1, 13, 14,
 19, 26-7, 48, 111; the Great, 31,
 41, 91
 Sabbath morning service, 9, 10, 13,
 71, 88, 110-11
Sacramentary of Sarapion, 35, 75,
 77, 100, 112
 Sacrifice, sacrifices, v, 15-16, 23, 31,
 40, 43, 60-4, 79, 85; time of morn-
 ing and evening, in the Temple,
 59-65
 Samuel b. Nahamāni, Rabbi, 105 n.6
 Samuel the Small, 3
Sanctus, 108
 Saturday. See Sabbath
 Saturus, 84
 Schechter, S., 25 n.1, 126, 127
 Schürer, E., 61
 Schwartz, E., 33 n.8, 52
Sēder R. Amrām, 4 n.1, 106 n.3
 Sephardic use, 11 n.2
 Septuagint, 18, 71-2
 Sext, 46-7, 60-2, 64-9
Shaharīth, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 60-4,
 106
 Shammai, school of, 17
Shema', the, 12, 16-22, 53, 60, 63,
 64, 102-5, 110; given to Moses at
 Sinai, 21, 105; Roman prohibition
 of, 102-3
Shemōneh Esrēh. See 'Amīdāh
Sifrē, 19
 Silvanus, bp. of Gaza, 87
 Simeon b. Jehozadak, Rabbi, 15
 Simeon ha-Paḳōli, 23
 Singer, S., 11
 Socrates, 41, 42, 97
 Sozomen, 36
 Spain, the Church in, 56, 58 n.1
 Strawley, J. H., 9, 111
 Station days, 37-42, 55, 82, 94, 112
 Stephen, 1, 7
 Strack, H. L., 4 n.1, 14 n.5
 Streeter, B. H., 38 n.4
 Sunday, 9, 10, 26-36, 41, 42, 53-5,
 58 n.2, 69, 72, 80 n.6, 82-5, 92,
 94, 95, 99, 105, 111
 Synagogue, the, debt of the Church
 to, vii, 2, 8, 39, 42, 44, 51, 64, 70,
 71, 74-82, 88-9, 97, 99, 102-13;
 in the early Church, 7, 72; pre-
 sence of Jesus in, 1, 25; origin of,
 16, 60, 70
 Syria, 5, 34, 50-4, 100
Tanhuma, 14 and n.5
 Taylor, C., 38 n.4
Tefillāh. See 'Amīdāh

<p>Temple, the Jerusalem, v, 1, 2, 7, 15, 16, 20-1, 23, 24, 28, 43, 59-60, 62-5</p> <p><i>Terce</i>, 46-7, 60-2, 64-9</p> <p>Tertullian, vii, 9 n.1, 33, 38, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 55, 60, 61, 64-7, 81-5, 97, 100, 103, 105, 106</p> <p><i>Testament of Our Lord</i>, 34, 40-1, 52-4, 100, 112</p> <p>Thursday, 37-9, 42, 71; reading of <i>Tōrāh</i> on, 13</p> <p>Timothy, bp. of Alexandria, 35 n.3</p> <p><i>Tōrāh</i>, 1, 2-3, 7, 18, 19, 29, 73, 79; superiority of the Gospel to, 72 n.3</p>	<p><i>Trisagion</i>, 108 n.4</p> <p><i>Vespers</i>, 51, 58, 70</p> <p>Vigil, 41, 42, 51</p> <p>Vokes, F. E., 38 n.4</p> <p>Washing before prayer, 44</p> <p>Wednesday, 32, 38-42, 112</p> <p>Week, first day of the. <i>See</i> Sunday</p> <p>Whitsun, 82, 83, 100</p> <p>Woolley, R. M., 9</p> <p><i>Yigdal</i>, 12</p> <p><i>Yōzér 'Or</i>, 20, 74 n.6, 105-6</p>
--	---

THE ALCUIN CLUB—of which Dr. Walter Howard Frere was for many years the President—exists for the object of promoting the study of the History and Use of the Book of Common Prayer and Christian Liturgies. It encourages, by publications and other means, the practical study of the English liturgy with its ceremonial, and the arrangement of churches, their furniture, and ornaments, in accordance with the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, strict obedience to which is the guiding principle of the work of the Club. During the last half-century the Alcuin Club has issued some hundred publications—Collections, Smaller Books, Pamphlets, and Leaflets—and Members of the Club are entitled to the publications of the current year *gratis*. The subscription for Members is 21s. per annum. Application for election and for the List of Publications should be sent to the Assistant Secretary, as well as all subscriptions.

President:

THE RIGHT REVEREND J. W. C. WAND, K.C.V.O., D.D.

Chairman:

THE REV'D. CANON W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D.

Committee:

THE RIGHT REV'D. D. C. DUNLOP, M.A.

PROFESSOR I. L. FOSTER, M.A., F.S.A.

THE REV'D. R. C. D. JASPER, M.A., D.D., F.R.HIST.S.

THE REV'D. M. R. J. MANKTELOW, M.A.

THE REV'D. C. E. POCKNEE, A.K.C.

THE REV'D. H. B. PORTER, PH.D.

DR. F. J. E. RABY, C.B., LITT.D., F.B.A.

THE REV'D. G. G. WILLIS, PH.D.

THE REV'D. G. B. TIMMS, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer*

THE REV'D. F. C. WALDEN-ASPY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary*

St. James's Vicarage, Littlehampton, Sussex

Assistant Secretary and Treasurer:

MISS W. K. MEDWAY, c/o Theological Department, King's College,
Strand, London, W.C.2

A complete set of Alcuin Club publications is now in the Library of King's College, Strand, and may be consulted by members and associates of the Alcuin Club on application to the Librarian.

Members wishing to obtain publications that are marked as out of print should inquire from the Assistant Secretary whether a second-hand copy is available.

IN BUT NOT OF THE WORLD

Initially this little book was asked for by the Interseminary Committee of the National Council of Churches, to provide a study book about the ministry for a national conference of the Interseminary Movement. The Committee saw the author as one who had just come from the pastorate of a rather prophetic church in downtown New York, to a position where wider perspective—geographical and possibly theological—might be expected. The arresting problems and claims tackled here, as it turns out, are certainly not just for seminarians or ministers, but for laymen who know something about the urgency of the situation.

In But Not Of the World

A Notebook of Theology and Practice

*BV
600.2
in the Local Church*

573

By

ROBERT W. SPIKE



Published for
THE INTERSEMINARY COMMITTEE OF
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

ASSOCIATION PRESS
NEW YORK

IN BUT NOT OF THE WORLD
A NOTEBOOK OF THEOLOGY AND PRACTICE IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

*Copyright © 1957 by
National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations*

Association Press, 291 Broadway, New York 7, N.Y.

All rights reserved, including the right of reproduction in whole or in part in any form, under the International, Pan-American, and Universal Copyright Conventions.

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Library of Congress catalog card number: 57-6883

55

Printed in the United States of America
American Book-Stratford Press, Inc., New York

To Alice

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	ix
I. <i>Koinonia</i> and Church Fellowship	1
II. The Body of Christ and the Church's Living Heritage	22
III. The Authority of the Word and the Church Program	42
IV. No Salvation Outside the Church and Evangelism	64
V. The Kingdom of God and How the Church Lives in It	89

Foreword

In the 17th chapter of the Gospel of John we read these words in the great prayer for the Church:

"I do not pray that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. . . . As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into thy world."

Here we have posed the great dilemma of the Christian church. Here the words of Jesus lay out the map of the country in which the called-out people of God must dwell in time—in the world, but not of it; thoroughly immersed in the human struggle and yet holding the passport of a homeland whose boundaries lie beyond our senses and even our imaginings.

Now it is one thing to note this tension, and quite another to live the life of the Church in such tension. And yet live it we must. Our hungry souls have driven us in the last two decades to cry out for a clearer doctrine of the Church. We have been slowly perceiving that such a doctrine is an indispensable part of a whole theology. The necessity for new study in this area was born first

in the discussions that produced the ecumenical movement and its visible expression, the World Council of Churches. It has been reinforced by the general resurgence of theological inquiry and by confessional endeavors to rethink the bases for their own traditions.

Yet the practice of the Church sometimes seems to have little recognizable acquaintanceship with the emerging doctrine of the Church. It is all very well to be facile about the divine nature of the Church or about its apostolic mission, but when you seek answers to the questions, "In what way is my membership in the First Protestant Church a unique experience?" or, "How does my church confront the community with the saving gospel?"—then the real test of a doctrine of the Church is made.

We have many excellent works on the nature of the Church. Newbigin's *The Household of God*¹ and Nelson's *The Realm of Redemption*² are two of the best. Yet it is still true that American Protestants have no clear feeling-apprehension of the Church as their primary community of loyalty. The mores and values of the churches are so mixed up with the goals and folkways of American culture that the situation is more desperate than we often admit to ourselves.

In fact, a good case could be made for the observation

¹ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Household of God* (New York: Friendship Press, 1954).

² J. Robert Nelson, *The Realm of Redemption* (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1951).

that in many ways American Protestant churches are *of* the world, but not *in* it. That is, that whatever Christology is claimed by creed or covenant, the real "Lord of the Church" is the dominant drive of the culture at the time. This does not mean that our churches are deliberately apostate or are even very conscious of how molded their life is by the powerful currents of a mass communications age. The minister frequently makes superficial references to the enemies of the Church in phrases like "materialism," "secularism," or "success philosophy." Yet these allusions seem to be so general that little serious judgment is brought to bear upon our common life by them. Moreover, we frequently make the assumption that these alien world views are true only of institutions and people other than the Church; or we rush hastily through the statement that of course the Church has its share of sinfulness, and seem to conclude that there is little we can do about it.

The rising walls of a majestic new theology of the Church must not be allowed to become theological talk only. It is ironic that a resurgence of historic terminology about the uniqueness of the Christian church can obscure how much *of* the world we really are. We can get the illusion of being separated from the world, but actually all we may be doing is setting up a neat compartment within the pluralistic American scene, where we can talk our own brand of gobbledegook, lay out our own genteel variation on respectable be-

havior, and tell our own family jokes. In social dynamics, we are so similar to other semiprivate compartments, the business community, the fraternal costume ball, the academic life, that we may move from one to the other, and into the church and out, with little adjustment of outlook or concern.

The intention of this book is to examine the life and practice of American Protestant churches in the light of the emerging theological consensus about the nature of the Church. This study is certainly not an exhaustive analysis of our church life, nor does it give very many conclusive answers about what we should do. It is simply an attempt to do what must be done in a more detailed and continuing way, namely, looking at doctrine and practice together. This does not mean that a specific set of "how to" plans can ever be deduced from theological insights. Nor does it mean that doctrine is not true unless it is immediately and pragmatically vindicated. It does mean that faith and order and life and work must at points be considered together—or two different institutions, neither one of them wholly the Church, will develop.

J. Robert Nelson's work, *The Realm of Redemption*, has been indispensable in laying out the main areas of doctrine and the central problems in these areas, which are of paramount interest in contemporary theology. This scholarly summary has been the guide for the sections on doctrine. He is, of course, to be completely

absolved from responsibility for the implications the author has drawn from his study.

Three historic definitions of the Church that have been returned to liveliness in theological discussion recently are the centers of the first three chapters—*koinonia*, the body of Christ, and “where the Word of God is preached and the sacraments rightly administered.” The last two chapters are built around two of the crucial theological questions involved in the doctrine of the Church. They are, “Is there salvation outside the Church?”, and “How is the Church related to the kingdom of God?”

In each chapter, a particular aspect or problem of contemporary American parish life is yoked with the doctrinal statement.

Undoubtedly these linkages are somewhat arbitrary. It is left to the reader to provide the necessary qualifications and cross references.

CHAPTER I

Koinonia and Church Fellowship

EPISODE

David Lyons pulled into the driveway of his split-level home at a speed just exceeding that of his normal entrance. He stopped close to the house to let out his wife, who was laden down with empty dishes. He could tell by the resigned way she moved toward the door that she knew how annoyed he was, although he hadn't said a word. She was probably phrasing in her mind how she would open the inevitable discussion. "No, Dave, you can't judge the whole church by what happens at a family night supper," she would say. Or, "Really, Dave, it wouldn't hurt you to unbend a little bit. Mr. Jenkins' jokes may be a trifle ministerial, but he is actually very nice." And what could he say to that? She was absolutely right. All the people at the church did seem friendly and eager to be neighborly, but—well, he just didn't have time to get involved in another group.

He drove on into the garage, helped Susan, age two, out of the car, and went with her into the kitchen. He picked up his briefcase where he had hurriedly tossed it on his way from the office to the church. He had a lot of work to do tonight, and Mary Lyons understood the silent reproof he intended to convey by the way he swung the briefcase. He sat down at the dining-room table and began his work. Nothing more was said until after Susan was put to bed and Mary came and sat down at the table.

"I know you didn't want to go to the family night supper at the church, Dave, but really, if we're going to belong to the church, we have to go to things."

"Why?" he asked, more sharply than he intended. "I mean, Susan goes to Sunday School, and we go to church fairly regularly. We contribute our share. I believe the church is important to a community, and I even get something out of laughing boy's sermons occasionally." He noticed her pained expression at the gibe and said, "I'm sorry, Jenkins is okay, I guess, but he symbolizes what I really can't take as far as this church is concerned. Everyone is trying so hard to be such an eager beaver. If I've heard it once, I've heard it a hundred times. We're a *friendly* church. We're a *friendly* church. Personally, I'm suspicious when you have to keep talking about it. Anyway, I already belong to more groups than I can handle. You know how the boss is. He wants all the junior executives in the

office to be a close social group as well as a working team. And now that I've taken on this job as secretary of the Civic Association, we just have to spend time entertaining the people I'm going to be working with. And there are both families. You know how your mother is about Sunday evenings. Besides, I don't see why the church has to try to pre-empt the social life of its people. It seems to me its main job is to give its members individual inspiration. The thing I like about Sunday morning service is that I can be quiet and sort of at peace."

Mary was silent for a minute. She stared hard at the pewter teapot on the buffet, and tried to assemble her thoughts for a rejoinder. She was confused too about the church's stress on fellowship, and didn't know where to begin. She tried to remember what Mr. Jenkins had said when he spoke to the women's society last month.

"Dear, I'm not sure whether I've got it exactly right or not, but fellowship is important in a church for more than just social reasons. Sometimes it even seems to me that Mr. Jenkins thinks fellowship is the main reason for the church's existence. He's spoken many times about the church of the first century when everyone felt so close together that they even held all their possessions in common. It's got something to do with a Greek word. *Koinonia*, that's it." She was proud to have remembered it.

"What on earth are you talking about, Mary Lyons? And what is this fellowship stuff anyway? Isn't it just liking people and enjoying being with them? Personally, that bunch at the church is the last group I'd choose to have a good time with."

"Dave, please don't be impatient. I told you I'm not really sure why, but I do know fellowship is important. Every important person in that church keeps saying so, and we've got to act as though we think so too, if we're going to belong."

DOCTRINE

Koinonia is a word frequently employed by the apostles to describe the essential character of the Church. The English translation, "fellowship," is quite inadequate to carry the full meaning of the word. The New Testament employs it in several ways that give varying shades of meaning to the pattern of experience the early church meant by *koinonia*. The different translations given in the Revised Standard Version are an illustration of how the context necessitated several usages.

There are those passages that seem to use the word to describe the close spiritual relationship between the believers and God, either through the person of Christ or the Holy Spirit.

In Paul's benediction in II Corinthians 13:14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God,

and the (*koinonia*) fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all," the familiar translation is used. In Philippians 2, "So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any incentive of love, any participation (*koinonia*) in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind," a more active word is chosen. And this usage of the word to refer to close communication between redeemed men and God is specifically related to the Lord's Supper in I Corinthians 10:16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation (*koinonia*) in the blood of Christ?" Thus on one level, the *koinonia* is seen as a mystical relationship between men and God.

In I John 1:3, however, the term is widened to describe this spiritual uniting with God and also with one another: "That which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you, so that you may have fellowship (*koinonia*) with us, and our fellowship (*koinonia*) is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

And then there are those places where the writer uses the word to indicate the common life of the community of believers only. In Acts 2:42, at the end of the account of Pentecost, it is written of the new church, "And they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship (*koinonia*), to the breaking of bread and the prayers."

Sometimes this is used even more specifically to relate to mutual interdependence and responsibility for the weaker members of the group. In Romans 15:26, it is recorded, "For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased to make some contribution for the poor among the saints (*koinonia*) at Jerusalem."

And in II Corinthians 8:4, it is similarly used, "begging us earnestly for the favor of taking part in the relief of the saints."

Koinonia in the New Testament seems to be a comprehensive description of the unique life of the community of believers. It is a community that is closely and personally interdependent, but deriving its life from the amazing power of God that is the Holy Spirit. It fundamentally seems to mean "participation in something in which others also participate."¹

The Church defined as *koinonia* seems close to being a psychological description. This does not mean that it was unreal, or something completely the subjective experience of the people who were gathered together. In fact, it means almost the opposite. *Koinonia* was a recognizable togetherness that people felt in their whole being, their mind and body. This togetherness was there only because they felt the reality of God impinging upon their minds and physical beings. The

¹ J. Y. Campbell, "Koinonia and Its Cognates in the New Testament," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, p. 353, as used in Nelson, *The Realm of Redemption*, p. 53.

translation "participation" is well used, because it avoids the chicken-and-egg argument about which precedes which, human association or awareness of the divine. It is true that the sense of commonality was based upon finding themselves companions on the same road upon which they had been set by Christ. But also there is little sense of surprise in the New Testament that Christ should have revealed God to others in the same way. An integral part of the wonder of *koinonia* with God, was that he should have come to dwell in the midst of all humanity, of which they were just a small part. It was the furthest possible distance away from "My God and I, we walk the fields together."

Furthermore, after the initial sense of the gift of grace, the continuing presence of God is expected to manifest itself within the community of the faithful. Nelson says that "the Holy Spirit is henceforth a corporate, not an individual possession. The Spirit dwells in the body. Apart from this corporate community, there is no gift of the Holy Spirit." The church as *koinonia* is a sphere of faith, experience, social intercourse, and loyalty that has unquestioning primacy in the lives of those who are a part of it. This primacy does not arise from a sense of duty or responsibility, but rather from the experience of the reality of God's presence in the midst of the congregation.

CULTURE

The church as *koinonia* is perhaps almost incomprehensible to modern Americans if it is thought of just as fellowship in the customary usage of the term. This word immediately calls up all the powerful psychological and sociological beliefs about group life held as dogma by the popular mind of our day. There has probably never been an age when men and women were more self-conscious about the intricacies and subtleties of their "interpersonal relationships." This preoccupation with social dynamics has two manifestations in our culture that must be taken into account.

The first concern is the widely discussed theme of loneliness and feelings of alienation that characterize our times. The fact that such discussion has become more and more cliché ridden does not alter the fact that it bespeaks some truth. The most important thing about this feeling is not that people feel isolated, but that they are confused as to what they are isolated from. This is the real tragedy that hides behind the tremendous increase in psychosis or the growth of a literature and art of human disintegration. Is it estrangement from self, from tradition, from family groups, or from God? Only a few voices of any status outside the professionally religious offer the last thought, and they are either discounted by the major critics (both in psychiatric theory and the arts) or thought to be

poetizing truth. In any case, whatever reality lies in the characterization of our time as an age of loneliness is not likely to be challenged by the notion that the church is a congenial group of nice people who enjoy believing in the Christian faith together. It is surely a form of gnosticism to imply that the Christian faith has reality only because a group of people join together to promote it and advertise themselves as believers in it.

Another aspect of the fragmentation and breakdown of communication in our times is the extravagant multiplicity of cure-alls promoted to banish the condition. This might indeed be considered the heart of the problem: not that there is loneliness in the land, but that there is such a fantastic variety of experiences offered to us to banish the loneliness—from dianetics to the search for Bridey Murphy, from audio-visual aids to group dynamics, from psycho-social to socio-psychical analyses of human behavior, from vitamin pills to deep freezes. So it goes. In such a phantasmagoria of experience, the fellowship of the church as unique human experience is inevitably set up in competition with satisfying social relationships of all kinds. Is the feeling of belonging to the church so deeply satisfying that no other group membership could take its place? To set out to prove that it is, seems on the surface to be the main business of the church. But can we devise any kind of church program or set of activities that will

prove it? There are churches so successful in becoming the centers of social life in a community that everyone who wishes a place in the status structure must belong. Genuine good feeling, pride in belonging, profound gratitude for the ministry of the church in times both of joy and of sorrow, may characterize a church, and yet *koinonia* may be absent. Unless a people be gathered by God, unless they be convinced that they are gathered by him, in a special way, unless there is a sense that the Holy Spirit is continually at work in their midst, then they are not a church.

The second aspect of our age's intense concern for analyzing personal relationships is known to us in that other cliché, the age of conformity. With all the variety of invention and gimmick, there is a surprising sameness that runs through the land. Though we turn up exotic new cults, they follow a well-worn path of the allowable. Though we make little outbursts of reckless political radicalism on the left or right, the center engulfs the deviation remarkably soon.

David Riesman, a brilliant sociologist, has provided us with the most penetrating analyses of this aspect of our life in *The Lonely Crowd* and *Individualism Reconsidered*. He characterizes the people of these times as *other-directed* personalities, in contrast to tradition-directed and inner-directed generations of former days. That is, whereas men and women of a culture like medieval feudalism lived in unconscious obedience to the

great norms of class and station, and men and women of the last century built their lives on certain all-encompassing principles and beliefs, so we seem to attune our behavior patterns to the tastes and goals of those immediately surrounding us. Riesman's word picture of the men and women of midcentury America as possessing invisible antennae which reach out to pick up the common feelings of the majority is almost classic. As Riesman describes this prevailing mood, and as it surely exists, it is not just a simple wish to be like everyone else, but is characterized by endless attempts to cover up this desire through protestations of freedom and minor revolts, none of which are so far afield that they cannot quickly become the accepted belief of tomorrow.

Into such a scheme of things, the American Protestant church can fit all too easily. What is easier to belong to than the local Protestant church of the old-line denominations? Moreover, the inverted kind of conformity that manifests itself in small daring and conspicuous difference is possible because of the interim of about thirty years at the beginning of this century when the church was passé. It can be a mark of the inside dopester (to use a Riesman phrase) to have taken up the church again. European theologians may be engaged in a process of demythologizing the New Testament, but American Christians are proudly engaged in swallowing the old myth without much chew-

ing. Thus it can become a fashionable thing to go to church, to read theology, or to become a professional layman.

What is more, in this age of oversensitivity to interpersonal affairs, the very people the church most needs may be alienated from it if fellowship and *koinonia* are thought to be interchangeable. The most discerning people know enough about group dynamics to recognize when they are being manipulated. For such people, spontaneity of experience becomes a test of the validity of the experience. Though this is not always completely reliable, it often seems to be more so than the guarantee of the sponsor whether it be commercial or ecclesiastical. Thus it may very well be that there is more joy in the familiar circle at the corner tavern than in the family night supper. To pretend that it is not so, or even to scold people because it is so, begs the haunting question.

How then, can the church compete for her rightful place as primary group? The answer seems to be obvious, that she should stop trying to do so, if this means simply trying to become a more attractive circle of personal acquaintances; for the church is based on a scandal, an affront to good taste, and a repudiation of sociability. Participation in Christian brotherhood is possible only because of the experience of the affront. God, the living lord of creation, has accosted me in the midst of my loneliness and my yearning after uniform-

ity. He has forced me to see the truth about myself and about the condition of all men. He speaks through a cross of utter loneliness, so that I know him not through theories about his existence, but through the understanding that he alone can share my "being" with me. He alone is ever completely loving, and completely sure. Through faith I am released from anxious slavery to all other demands. The church is made possible only because justification through faith releases men from bondage to all human institutions, no matter how precious they may be. The membership of the church is, foremost, that company of those who have passed from darkness into light, from death into life. What tie is deeper than the common experience of knowing the same Lord as Redeemer? Only in so far as men gathered together recognize that the same God has spoken to them all is there Christian brotherhood. Then they discover with delight that he speaks to them together. If there is no experience of the leadership of God in this brotherhood, then *koinonia* is absent.

Such flat assertions make us uncomfortable. We ask, How do we know if God is leading through his Holy Spirit? No list of characteristics can be drawn up to identify his action absolutely. If we attempt this, then we are usually defining the spirit of the group, not the Holy Spirit. This, however, is true: if a church has at its heart a group of men and women who have testified one to the other that God is real to them, and who

enter into one another's lives through prayer and study before God, then the Holy Spirit makes known his presence.

Such a brotherhood cannot be manufactured from a formula. Whenever an absolute blueprint for the constituting of the true Church is followed, it usually degenerates into a group of self-righteous puritans or a cell of spiritualists. Such a brotherhood stands continuously under the judgment of God. It is never immune from the threat of hypocrisy. In fact, it stands always more dangerously poised on the brink of this deadly sin. It is a precarious fellowship as far as men are concerned, but under God, the only lasting one.

A church that takes itself seriously as *koinonia* knows more about estrangement than it does about fellowship in the worldly sense. In fact, one of the essential marks of the church, the local church, must surely be its alienation from the gods of achievement, of conformity, of the spirit of the times. David Riesman, discussing the inner side of the need to conform, in his essay, "The Ethics of We Happy Few," says that *failure of nerve* would not be so serious in our times if we could comprehend *the nerve of failure*. He writes:

What is feared as failure in American society is, above all, aloneness. And aloneness is terrifying because it means that there is no one, no group, no approved cause to submit to. Even success—the seeming opposite of failure

—often becomes impossible to bear when it is not socially approved or even known. . . . For mere failure, provided it is found in company, can rather easily be borne; many ideologies have the function of making it possible for people to digest the worst miseries and even death. . . . On the other hand, one who is alone lacks this solace which can make even failure comfortable.

. . . The “nerve of failure” is needed to face the fact that the problem remains unsolved, and the possibility that it is insoluble. Thus we may experience defeat in our personal life-goals as well as in our social aims. Franz Kafka expressed these problems in his writing. He had the “nerve of failure”; he faced failure without illusion and without affirmation.²

Koinonia means acceptance of the nerve of failure as far as the tempting offers of cultural meaning outside the Christian faith are concerned.

It is also true that a church, participating in one another's lives through participation in Christ, knows joy as well as estrangement. This joy is not the tinkle of well-bred laughter over a ministerial joke. It is the sense of relief that comes from not having to pretend any more. To know that you are known by God must surely fill you with shame and the need for confession, but it also fills you with relief. The pure joy of escape

² David Riesman, *Selected Essays from Individualism Reconsidered* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955), p. 38. Permission granted by The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., copyright owners.

from "antennae adjusting" is Christian joy. The contrast between the earthy humor of Martin Luther as reflected in his sermons of later life and the tormented fear of God in his early life is a good illustration of the meaning of Christian joy. Then the mood changes from one of apprehension that you may not be quite fitting the mold of your level of society to expectancy that God will provide surprising opportunities every day to a church that holds to him in faith.

This sense of estrangement and of joy is the fruit of the life of faith. A church must know itself to be a separated people, a royal priesthood, a household of God.

PRACTICE

How does this come about in the local church? It comes about only when the leadership of the church puts first things first—the unequivocal preaching of the shock of the gospel, and the insistence on regenerate church membership. The meaning of the first necessity will be discussed in a later chapter, but let us examine the implications of a regenerate church membership. The words call up resistances from those who remember how strictly our Christian tests of church membership have been applied. In reaction to a former period of heavyhanded judgmentalism as far as church membership is concerned, much of contemporary

Protestantism has adjusted itself in two ways. Those churches which historically have used creeds as a part of their order, expect verbal assent but emphasize to new members that broad interpretation is possible. Those churches which have been essentially covenantal rather than creedal have reduced the covenant to a statement of aims and platitudes of co-operation and, as a matter of fact, accept people into membership mostly on the basis of their willingness to join, no matter what the motivation.

As unfortunate as this is, the restoration of a regenerate church membership can not be resolved simply by the setting up of proper screening procedure. It is a tempting but essentially wrong idea to try to build a model church where no one feels at home, and indeed is not admitted, if he cannot frame his religious belief in precisely the same formula as everyone else has done or wear the same religious habits. There are way stations along the road to faith. There is great variety in people's capacity to receive the full measure of religious truth. The complex mixture of essential non-Christian values in our culture with those still firmly related to the Christian heritage presses us toward the drawing of lines and the setting of tests which will separate the wheat from the chaff. Most churches certainly invite criticism for the easy and painless way people get their names added to the roll.

And yet the creation of a regenerate church does not lie in the creation of new ways to wall itself off from the world.

Two great traditions within Christendom have become the heritage of all Protestantism—the church as a gathered community and the church as parish. The view of the church as *koinonia* is fundamentally the process of finding itself as a gathered community, but this must never be done to the exclusion of its parish responsibility. What must be discovered in the local church is a way to express its life as a unique special people without fostering the implication that this is a specialness of pious superiority. Some modern adaptation of the relationship between catechumens and the baptized in the early church must emerge. It is necessary to think of every church in terms of concentric circles. The widest ring includes all those who are somehow related to the church, either by marriage, or through some superficial contact with the church. It includes both the people who, if pressed for religious affiliation, would name the church as theirs, and also the people who might not own it. The next ring includes the nominal members, and also those who are seeking. The inner ring is the fully gathered church, those who know Whom they have believed, those in full communion. These circles can never be too rigidly defined. But the heart of the church, the gathered ones,

must be aware of these groups, and must constantly be seeking to draw people closer to the heart of the church. The whole organism is in some larger sense the church, but the heart which is the generator lies in the center. A regenerate church membership is the corporate life of the ones who are in full communion with God and with one another. The enlargement of that group, through the magnification of the witness of the life that is there, is the way to proceed toward a regenerate church.

This is a delicate art, and is the essence of pastoral responsibility. This does not mean that it is solely the responsibility of the minister. It should be increasingly the shared work of those who know *koinonia* in its deeper dimension.

One of the most obvious implications of such a concept is that full membership in the church should not be possible without sufficient experience in the life, worship, and study of the church, so that its full significance is clear. No one ought to enter into church membership (either by confession of faith or transfer of letter) without adequate orientation and study. This does not equate regenerate church membership with adequate information about Christianity, but it is one essential ingredient, particularly in a time of such general illiteracy about the essentials of the gospel.

The requirements for study, like any other standard of full membership in the church, must not be viewed as ways to keep people out of the church. The need is to provide hungry people with the full meat of the gospel, to spread before them the rich sustenance that is the historic Christian faith, so that they may be filled in their whole being.

The entire matter of the disciplines of the Christian life is related to a regenerate church membership. The fruits of the spirit embodied in character and personality can never be dismissed or supplanted. What is earnestly needed is a new appreciation of the decisive areas of personal Christian witness in our times. The boy scout good deed and the "nice" smile are pallid representatives of the faith of the Cross. A compassion that crosses over the lines of class and race and taste, and an integrity which resists the comfortable blandishments of the *status quo* are indeed the most needful attributes of Christian character.

No amount of participation in the organized life of the church, nor fervor for civic good works, can compensate for the absence of these luminous marks of the Christian man; for *koinonia*, after all, is the meeting of the holiness of God with whole men. The church must cease trying to arrange partial encounters with the spiritual ideas of men, or with the social needs of men. Moralism or recreationism are the chief results of

such attempts to minister in competition or in concert with the culture. God claims a man in all the roles he has to play, and bids him be "one" and be as "one" with his brethren in the church.

CHAPTER II

The Body of Christ and the Church's Living Heritage

EPISODE

"And then, George, we could sell the old building to the new corporation that's building all those parking garages downtown."

Henry Zimmerman, chairman of the board of trustees of St. John's Protestant Church was having lunch with George Robertson, another member of the board, at the City Club. George was examining the site map of a new housing development on the south side of town which Henry had brought with him. There was a large red X crayoned in on one of the best corners in the new development.

George didn't say anything, so Henry began talking again, in a more excited tone. "You know very well, George, that our days are numbered at the present location. Why, I'll bet right now, over half of our mem-

bership drives more than a mile to church, and the greatest number of them live out on the south side. The old neighborhood is changed, George, you might as well face it. They're just not our kind of people."

George cleared his throat and asked a question. "Are there any other churches planning to build out in the new development?"

Henry said, "That's just the point, George. We can get in on the ground floor now. I'm sure we could get the comity assignment from the Council of Churches, and beat all the other denominations out there."

George remarked that it certainly was something to think about, and nothing more was said until the two men were having cigars and coffee in the library following lunch.

"Well, George, what about it?" Henry asked. The other man took a long drag on his cigar, exhaled, and said, "I suppose it's the logical thing to do, Henry, but what about the church's responsibility to the neighborhood where we are? It's been there a long time. My grandfather helped build it."

"Mine did too, and that's why I feel so strongly about it. It's a part of our lives, and I think we should move it where it will be near us. Our families have put a lot into it—let's be quite candid about it; and we ought not to stand by and let the thing just peter out, or be turned into some kind of mission."

Just a touch of red came into George's face as he

spoke. Only his closest friends would know that some indignation was stirring within him.

"Henry, that's mighty close to saying that the church belongs to the people who give the most money to it. Pardon me for sounding so dramatic, but that church belongs to Christ, and not to you, nor to me, nor to the minister, nor anyone else who is a part of it."

Henry Zimmerman was embarrassed to have provoked so much vehemence in his friend. He had known him since they were both children, and he realized he had gone too far.

"You're right; of course you're right, if you bring theology into it. But that's just the point; as good stewards of Christ's church we have to be practical about it. We should move it where it can continue to serve the families that belong to it. After all, we are the body of Christ. That's in the New Testament, I know. And then there's that poem the minister before last was always quoting, 'Christ has no hands but our hands to do his work today.'"

George looked sad. "Somehow, Henry, I don't think that's what being the 'body of Christ' means. We belong to something bigger than this congregation, no matter how much involved it is with our own family history. Something gives this church a life that is more than the sum of all the work we put into it. Maybe we should move the church. I'm not sure. But we mustn't do it just because it's more convenient for us

and some of the other old families, no matter how fancy the rationalization." He smiled.

DOCTRINE

The "body of Christ" is the other New Testament term which stands as a basic point of orientation for much contemporary theological thinking about the church. Again the full connotation is lost to our modern minds because of the varying denotations in the Scriptures as the word is applied in different situations. The application of this term in different situations indicates that there was a common understanding and wide corporate usage in the early church.

Essentially the problem revolves around how metaphorical or how literal the term is intended to be construed.

In I Corinthians 12:27, Paul says directly to the church, "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it," after having expounded the absolute interresponsibility of all who are in the church. He says the same thing in Romans 12:5, "So we, though many, are one body in Christ and individually members one of another."

In the first chapter of Colossians, in the 18th verse, a different perspective is added, when in a summary of the unique attributes of Christ, he is identified as "the head of the body, the church." In the 24th verse of the same chapter, Paul adds the conjoining note of Christ's

suffering and the suffering of the faithful, thus: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's affliction for the sake of his body, that is the church."

In Paul's account of the Eucharist, this term is related to the meaning of the breaking of the bread: "The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf." (I Corinthians 10:16-17)

There is obviously more intended here than an apt illustration. Paul is not saying that the church is "like" a body. There is a close continuity between the man and the events which are summed up in the phrase, Jesus Christ, and the community of believers. But this continuity is not to be thought of as an exhaustive category, hence Paul's shifting in some sections to the usage that Christ is "head" of the body.

To equate the ongoing Church with the person of Christ leads to a spiritualizing evaporation of the meaning of the Only Begotten Son of God as the final and all-sufficient revelation of God. The Church is not just an extension of the Incarnation.

Far short of that heresy, however, is the essential truth that the brethren who are bound together in faith and are obedient to the gospel are closely identified with the Ever Living Christ. Where else can men look in history for the flesh-and-blood evidence of his

eternal life—in doctrine, in ceremony, in organization? All these give some testimony to his abidingness, but all of them are empty without the lives of the men who write the doctrine, or share in the ceremony, or administer the organization. And just as truly these lives are empty of him unless they be “in Christ,” as the New Testament continually insists is the proper term for belonging to him. The body of Christ says to us, in Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s distinction, that the Church is *person* and not institution.

Beyond that, this term for the Church says to us that the whole living history of what God did and is doing in the gift of Christ is contemporaneous in and with the life of those who become his through faith. Paul Minear, in *Eyes of Faith*, reminds us that the Jews characteristically thought of one man as embodying the whole race. Adam, Abraham, Moses, and Elijah represented to the Jews both themselves and the whole race; and the figure of the Suffering Servant is always interpreted to be the people of Israel. There is a whole conception of social history implicit in the Church as the body of Christ—truly organic in that the individual Christian community incorporates the history of the whole species, and yet not at all organic if this is thought of as a kind of automatic reproduction. The seeds of the Holy Purpose are within the Church, but God controls the growth and the fruit.

CULTURE

The doctrine of the body of Christ runs bluntly against a doctrinaire view of history in our times that cannot accept it. This is a view that no longer completely dominates the academic field, but has become widely accepted as an unexamined premise of everyday life. It is that history essentially has no meaning save as a prelude to the here and now. All history is a collection of objectively verifiable facts about events that were essentially neutral when they happened. The men of the past put their own interpretations to work upon these facts and thus created the traditions and cultural values of civilization. But since we can see, looking backward, that these were only partial judgments, they are without commanding meaning to us. Therefore, to a large degree, they are unreal. The powerful realities of life are all encompassed in what is happening now, and education is to be conceived as an ever-widening exposure to the immediately experiential.

A classic statement of the basic purpose of education, widely held during the last thirty years, is found in L. Thomas Hopkins' *Interaction: The Democratic Process*:

The education of a child is an inclusive continuous process. It goes on all of the time anywhere and everywhere he may be. It is affected to some extent by every-

thing that is within his psychological field. . . . This process of relationship among individuals, young and old, is clearly defined for us as the democratic way of life. The quality of the child's total education is the quality of that democratic living. And the quality of his education through the school is judged by how well it squares with the principles of democratic living.¹

Hopkins then goes on to spell out the democratic way of life in terms of process and immediate satisfaction:

To achieve the good life the American people have wisely centered their attention upon the *process* of living. They realize that the way in which the good life of the present is achieved will determine whether any of it will exist for the future. The process of deriving the abundance of today may be the means toward the scarcity of tomorrow. The needs which the American people must satisfy in order to feel the goodness in the life are reasonably clear. They need (1) adequate food, shelter, and clothing to keep the body functioning effectively; (2) reasonable freedom of movement, speech, and thought; (3) some personal distinction before others; (4) acceptance by others into the activities of group life; (5) opportunity to build an unique self and personality; (6) favorable conditions for earning a livelihood; (7) economic security for old age; (8) opportunity to marry and rear children in a wholesome family life; (9) faith in

¹ L. Thomas Hopkins, *Interaction: The Democratic Process* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1941), p. 3. Used by permission.

their ability to make life continually better or faith that the best efforts of the group will bring the better life in the present and reveal new needs to raise their level of living in the future. . . .²

This philosophy of "nowness" just described is no longer unchallenged in educational circles, but it has been widely assimilated into the assumptions of American life. Or perhaps it is derivative from the frontier character of American life itself, and is still a part of our life even though the physical frontiers are largely behind us. When this mind-set is strong upon us, it is impossible for us to think of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ in any other terms than a story from the past—a magnificent story surely, and one to be reckoned with because of the fresh judgment it brings whenever it is told. But when we assert in all seriousness that those who draw near to Christ in faith are bound together in a tie transcending time and space and that this is more important than belonging to the same social background, we seem to be talking sentimental nonsense.

This denial of authoritative meanings in the Christian interpretation of history, however, has not snuffed out the longing for meaning in events. The complex of contemporary life in America is taken as the norm of value—home and family, school, church and commu-

² *Ibid.*, p. 4f. Used by permission.

nity, individual freedom, prosperity, and peace. The point of view expressed by Dr. Hopkins is evidence of this. In addition we proceed cautiously into the past, glamorize and edit American history to enhance the worth of our own categories of judgment. Will Herberg, in *Catholic, Protestant, Jew*, documents the development of a religion of Americanism which is the real universal value structure of our people. He also points out that the resurgence of popularity for organized religion is a part of this universal religion. The three major religious traditions in America are felt to be of equal validity, just as long as they buttress a general religion of goodness, fair play, and morality. This reduces all religious traditions to ethical systems and folk legends which are ultimately of no decisive importance, except that one of them must be embraced.

Over against this, the Christian has to say that to belong to the church is to enter into a configuration of past and present which has a life of its own which shapes individual life and provides the only loyalty to which the whole human life can be given. To be in Christ is to take seriously the communion of the saints. To do this, it is necessary to embrace the central foolishness and scandal of the gospel, that is, that God entered into human history in the person of Jesus Christ, and that this was a decisive act for human history—decisive not only in the sense of its being historically influential but crucial and final in the ultimate

meaning of human life. All who through faith recognize this decisive event, acknowledge Christ to be the Lord of History. They draw nigh to him, and in a way enter into him. Such a belief is closely related to the Cross and the Resurrection. "Christ is risen. Christ lives," is the most ancient affirmation of the Christian church. All who respond to the power of that cry, not just in intellectual assent, but in the full giving of their lives to that one truth, are made one in him. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." Christ in some way lives in and through his church.

Such a belief, unfortunately, can also be distorted to a simple kind of pragmatism. Christ is reduced to a helpless, formless spirit, who is materialized only by the will of men who are followers of his ideals. Churchmen often "use" the image of Christ to urge the church to undertake this scheme or undergird that campaign.

To belong to the body of Christ does require obedience to the teaching of Christ, but its more profound meaning is that men and women are shaped by the Living Spirit of Christ. One receives from the whole Church, through the ages and in the present, more than can be given. In fact, one must receive first, before anything can be given.

The difficult hurdle for the modern man to get over is the shallow view that only the present is real. He cannot truly belong to the Church until he gives himself to the rich heritage of the Church, not out of anti-

quarian interest, but in the belief that time and space are obliterated in the kingdom of God.

There are few books more helpful in entering in upon such an understanding of the profound significance of Christian history than H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Meaning of Revelation*, as is evidenced by the following passages:

. . . It is one thing to perceive from a safe distance the occurrences in a stranger's life and quite a different thing to ponder the path of one's own destiny, to deal with the why and whence and whither of one's own existence. Of a man who has been blind and who has come to see, two histories can be written. A scientific case history will describe what happened to his optic nerve or to the crystalline lens, what technique the surgeon used or by what medicines a physician wrought the cure, through what stages of recovery the patient passed. An autobiography, on the other hand, may barely mention these things but it will tell what happened to a self that had lived in darkness and now saw again trees and the sunrise, children's faces and the eyes of a friend. Which of these histories can be a parable of revelation, the outer history or the inner one, the story of what happened to the cells of a body or the story of what happened to a self? When we speak of revelation in the Christian church we refer to our history, to the history of selves or to history as it is lived and apprehended from within.³

³ H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), pp. 59, 60. By permission of The Macmillan Company.

The inspiration of Christianity has been derived from history, it is true, but not from history as seen by a spectator; the constant reference is to subjective events, that is, to events in the lives of subjects. What distinguishes such historic recall from the private histories of mystics is that it refers to communal events, remembered by a community and in a community. Subjectivity here is not equivalent to isolation, non-verifiability and ineffability; our history can be communicated and persons can refresh as well as criticize each other's memories of what has happened to them in the common life; on the basis of a common past they can think together about the common future.

Such history, to be sure, can only be confessed by the community, and in this sense it is esoteric. One cannot point to historic events in the lives of selves as though they were visible to any external point of view. Isaiah cannot say that in the year King Uzziah died God became visible in the temple nor Paul affirm that Jesus the Lord appears to travellers on the Damascus road. Neither will any concentration of attention on Isaiah and Paul, any detailed understanding of their historical situation, enable the observer to see what they saw. One must look with them and not at them to verify their visions, participate in their history rather than regard it if one would apprehend what they apprehended. The history of the inner life can only be confessed by selves who speak of what happened to them in the community of other selves.⁴

⁴ *Ibid.*, by permission of The Macmillan Company.

W. H. Auden has a comparatively new poem called "The Old Man's Road," which describes in nontheological language the experience of belonging to the ancient covenant in the midst of modernity—

Across the Great Schism through our whole landscape
Ignoring God's Vicar and God's Ape
Under their noses unsuspected,
The Old Man's Road runs as it did
When a light subsoil, a simple ore,
Were still in vogue, true to His wherefore
By stiles, gates, hedgecops it goes
Over ploughland, woodland, cow meadows
Past shrines to cosmological myth
No heretics today would be caught dead with
Near hilltop rings that were so safe then
Now stormed easily by small children.
Shepherds use bits in the high mountains
Hamlets take stretches for Lovers Lanes
Then through cities threads its odd way
Now without gutters, a Thieves Alley.
Now with green lamp posts and white curb
The Smart Crescent of a high toned suburb
Giving wide berth to an old cathedral
Running smack through a new town hall
Unlookable for, by logic, by guess
Yet some strike it and are struck fearless
No life can know, but no life

That sticks to its course can be made captive
And who wanders with it are not stopped at
Borders by guards of a Theocrat.
The Old Man leaves His Road to those
Who love it no less since it lost purpose
Who never ask what History is up to,
So cannot act as if they knew
Assuming a freedom its powers deny
Denying its Powers, they pass freely.⁵

The one place where poetry seems to take Mr. Auden astray from the meaning of the communion of the saints would seem to be in the couplet, "Who never ask what History is up to, so cannot act as if they knew." Part of the meaning of belonging to the body of Christ, is the belief that human history has a purpose, and that God will bring it to fulfillment. Auden seems to be using the word "history" here to refer to men's plans for historical change. This is an affirmation that the meaning of history lies in God's hands, not that history is meaningless.

The greatest single factor in helping the contemporary Church to understand what it means to belong to the body of Christ has been the growth of the ecumenical movement. As barriers of space and tradition have been transcended, time also has been somehow

⁵ W. H. Auden, "The Old Man's Road" (New York: Voyages Press, 1956). By permission of the publisher.

transcended. It is not possible for churches of different communions to draw closer together without serious examination of the dynamics of why they drew apart from one another. Thus it is that the theology and practice of the churches which are a part of the World Council of Churches become closely linked to the issues that faced the Church during the Reformation. It is amazing how timely are the problems regarding inter-communion over which Calvin and Luther wrestled. It is more amazing to discover how the centuries intervening have provided enough experience so that some of the theological problems of the Reformation can now be pressed to conclusions not possible then.

PRACTICE

And again what about the local church? How does it help people to understand that they are the body of Christ? One of the channels is certainly the one mentioned above. That is, through constant interpretation of the excitement of the coming great Church. This must go beyond the level where it so largely rests in the minds of many laymen, namely, that it is a good thing to co-operate, and that all differences of tradition and doctrine are nonessential.

Somehow churchmen must begin to wrestle with the problems of faith and order that have been largely relegated to high-level theological conferences. This

does run the risk of developing controversy between churches of differing denominations, and perhaps further increase of denominational chauvinism. Such a risk has to be taken, however. Coalitions between churches on the basis of the least common denominator of belief are not very sound evidences of Christian unity.

More than anything else, however, the local church, in its worship and in its corporate educational life should paint the glory of the gospel on the widest possible canvas of the church's history. The glorious color of the biblical message, and of Christendom through the ages, should be used with all the means at our command. Many churches in this time preach and teach as if the gospel were a set of ethical maxims sent to it from the denominational publishing house.

Let us never mistake erudition about sacred history for the reality of being in Christ. For he lives now as surely as with Paul or Augustine. Nevertheless, we are all so caught up in the things of this present age, that we may only be able to recognize the Lord of all time when we ourselves enter with imagination and expectancy into the communion of the saints.

This identification with the Church in other times ought to bring a perspective that will enable people to see the mission of the Church today. When one links arms with the "glorious company of the Apostles, the

goodly fellowship of the Prophets, and the noble army of Martyrs," it is necessary to try to keep step. For the Church, when it has been most faithful to her Lord, has not been preoccupied with defining just precisely how it was coterminous with the body of Christ, but has been transfixated by the remembrance of the broken body of Christ himself.

If the life of the Church is truly more personal than institutional, which is one of the implications of the designation, "body of Christ," then the self-giving crucified Christ can never be far from the center of the Church's life.

Missionary giving is the traditional way churches in our times express this obedience to the Christ who gave himself for them. Somehow, this has degenerated into such stereotyped conceptions of patronizing beneficence or sentimentality, that to suggest that the contents of the second side of the offering envelope is our response to the passion of Christ becomes sacrilegious. There is a growing understanding, particularly among younger churchmen and men of the younger churches, that the mission of the Church has to be seen as one enterprise, whether in plush American Suburbia or awakening Indonesia. When American church members begin to understand that the same forces of naturalism and secularism are the enemies of the Christian church at their doorstep as well as abroad, then the whole mis-

sionary enterprise of the Church will take on an immediacy worthy of being our response to Christ's sacrifice.

The whole traditional structure of missionary enterprise related to American churches stands in a very precarious position right now. The vigor of the last century has hardened in so many places around the world into institutions of Christian philanthropy that new approaches to evangelism, completely outside the traditional structure, are necessary. This is as true of home missions as of foreign missions. Only the growth of the awareness that the mission is one, in the local church, in specialized fields at home and overseas, will give the energy that is needed.

This is surely difficult to communicate to a comfortable, well-budgeted middle-class church. One of the greatest burdens borne by the American missionary to-day is the obligation to make missionary addresses in the churches "supporting his work." The far-away look in the eye, the curious relish of the idiosyncracies of the people of the mission field, and the note of thankfulness that someone is brave enough to live so heroically are what usually face him across the lectern in the Ladies' Parlor.

Yet the twin of every problem the missionary faces daily sits facing him—carefully hidden by bright smiles of gentility—yet very much there. And over the heads

of the ladies he can sometimes see the smokestacks of a mill out on strike, or the distant barrier of railroad telegraph lines that mark the place where social intercourse ends.

CHAPTER III

The Authority of the Word and the Church Program

EPISODE

The Rev. Mr. William Green was preparing himself for a most difficult interview. He paced up and down the living room of the rectory. As he approached the closed dining-room door on one of the journeys around the room, he was amused to hear his wife admonishing the children, "Now stay out of there and don't bother Daddy. He's got an appointment with a problem."

If only Marguerite Lighthouse weren't such a really nice person, so that he could work up some angry resistance to the ideas she was pushing. She was really devoted to the church too, and he knew there was a minimum of ego involvement in this latest proposal. She was just an enthusiast, and the whole town knew that it was almost impossible to stand in the way of one of Miss Lighthouse's pet projects.

Bill Green sat down at the desk and picked up the neatly typed sheets of paper that Miss Lighthouse had given him the Sunday before. It was a proposal to work out a new curriculum for the church school. Miss Lighthouse was chairman of the Christian Education Committee of the church. Everyone thought the church was extremely fortunate to have her in that position, since she was the head of the guidance department of the local high school.

And she had been a good choice. Bill was grateful for the way she had taken up the problems of securing Sunday School teachers with the same efficiency that she brought to every enterprise entrusted to her. But this thing, this latest brainstorm that had hit her while she was away at summer school, was the end. Bill wondered how he could make clear to her that he wasn't skeptical of it because he felt defensive about the present curriculum of religious education in the church. He was sure that Marguerite's feeling about the deadness of the whole thing was quite right. But the outline he held in his hand was far worse. It seemed to be compounded of a mixture of group dynamics, pseudo psychology and nature worship. It purported to be a plan for reorganization of method, but actually was an outline of a general religious belief bordering on a substitute for the Christian faith.

The doorbell interrupted his unhappy thoughts. He went to the door and welcomed his expected visitor.

As they came back into the living room, chatting about the weather and the reopening of school, Bill could see that Marguerite's usual supreme self-possession and poise were a little unsteady today.

She came to the point quickly.

"Mr. Green, I've been thinking it was a little presumptuous of me to suggest such sweeping changes. I hope you're not offended."

"Don't be silly, Marguerite. I'm pleased that you are concerned enough to spend so much time working on plans for improvement in the church school." He hoped that this did not seem to commit him to approval of the idea.

Apparently it did, for she went on to say, "I'm glad you feel that way, Mr. Green. Of course we might not be able to put all these changes into effect all at once, but at least we have a master plan, a blueprint toward which to work. I tell you, Mr. Green, I got so excited about some of the things I learned at summer school that it just made me unhappy to think of what our own children and youth were missing in our church. They have such a limited experience, and the world is so wide. We must allow them to expand their horizons, to participate fully in the wonders of this modern world. It came to me all of a sudden—while I was listening to a sermon at the university church, as a matter of fact—that what we needed was a much broader program of activities."

The minister stalled for time by going to the door and asking his wife if she would bring in some tea. Should he hedge in expressing his real opinion, and pass the buck in a sudden remembrance that, after all, the whole committee would have to be informed before any discussion could take place? He knew that Marguerite Lighthouse would never fall for that dodge. So he decided to speak frankly.

"Marguerite, please don't misunderstand what I'm going to say. And don't interpret it as being complacency about the present situation. But this church school that you describe here wouldn't be a church school. It could just as easily be the program of a good settlement house or the Ethical Culture Society." He saw her raise her hand to protest, and so he went hurriedly on, "Oh, I know there would be references to Jesus and the good life and the beauty of God's world, but that isn't enough. And I'm not opposed to activity either. But it's all a question of where you begin. What are the sources of the church's life? What is our basic authority and our charter, if you will? That doesn't seem to be very clear in this document."

Marguerite didn't reply to the question. "I gather you don't like it," she said drily. Bill was sure that he had failed to communicate his real concern, and that he had merely succeeded in offending this lady for whom he had great respect.

But Marguerite recovered quickly and went on, "I'm

not sure I know what you mean, Mr. Green. I'll have to think about it. I think I believe, in answer to your question, that good educational procedures and good program planning are self-validating. They lead people to a better way of life."

Bill said, "You know, somehow I feel very much frustrated right now. I feel sure that I have completely failed to convey to this church a most important fact. That is, that we are not free to pick and choose at random the program into which we throw the energy of the church. We are all under the authority of the Word of God."

The discussion went on for some hours.

THE DOCTRINE

The third term brought to liveliness in recent discussion of the meaning of the Church is not a New Testament definition, but stems from the Reformation period. That is Calvin's measure for the authenticity of a Christian gathering calling itself a church, "where the Word of God is preached and heard, and the sacraments rightly administered." This standard emerged from the troubled morass in which the Church found itself in a time long after the apostolic age. The Word of God was so powerfully pervasive in the early church, both in remembered word and present deed, that no test needed to be applied. Whatever vagaries the early church got into in its daily encounter with the pagan

world, and whatever heretical notions threatened it, the Word of God as the authoritative category of church life was not seriously questioned. There was often disagreement as to how this Word was known, but there was little question that divine action was the source of the Church's authority; for the Word of God was Christ himself, and his leadership in and through the Church did not have to be defended.

In the sixteenth century, and certainly in our times, the question of the authority of the Christian gospel was and is seriously questioned. The appurtenances of the medieval Church were defended as self-validating in Calvin's time. In our day the consensus of pragmatic cultural opinions is asserted as the validating norm of value and belief. Thus the church must surely be defined as the place where the essential, independent, and decisive action which God brought about in Christ is clearly asserted and accepted. This obedience to the Word, that is, the life of the church constantly bringing itself under the judgment of Christ, is what Protestantism has felt is the surest way to keep the church worthy of its Lord. This Word of God is brought to the church, ever renewed through constant attendance upon the Holy Scriptures, preaching closely related to the Scriptures, and the sacraments. These are the ways provided through which the Word of God rings with most regular authenticity and integrity. Some have been able to recognize as the uplifting of the Word of

God the words of the Bible, interpreted or "broken open" through faithful preaching in the spirit of Christ. Others find it easier to recognize the Word in visible form and action in the sacraments. Here, on levels of perception and reception beyond the verbal, the grace of God is mediated to those who by faith know that Christ has opened this way for their saving health.

It is essential to the very power of the Word, administered through *both* preaching and sacrament, that the initiative of God in Christ be recognized, and that efficacy not be tied to the state of mind of those receiving the Word.

However, the belief in the objective quality of the transmission of the Word can be so woodenly held that it misses the real point that it is the living Christ who is offering himself through these means. The worship of the Bible or of the sacraments as the final and only repository of God's grace misses this point disastrously.

CULTURE

This essentially pragmatic test of the authenticity of any group calling itself a church in terms of faithfulness to the Word of God is the strongest safeguard against the church falling victim to metaphysical pragmatism. That is, there is strong pressure in the American scene to exalt activity and interest itself as the sufficient test of the worthwhileness of any enterprise. If people are attending meetings, volunteering their

time, enjoying their participation, then this often seems to justify the organization. Such a philosophy of busyness is widespread in the life of the church, and there are few people who are completely immune from its cogent persuasion. Thus, any kind of heresy can be preached or paraded in the church, if people like it.

The two kinds of churches which most easily seem to fall victim to the idea that "anything goes, as long as there is a crowd" are the old established city churches losing their congregations and bright new churches in the suburbs. Old churches can often find a new following if a persuasive spellbinder offers attractive homilies directed toward the assuaging of bodily and mental ills. The cities are filled with lonely people who find comfort or excitement in such a display, albeit not necessarily the glad good news of Christ.

New suburban churches are often put in the embarrassing position of not being able to cope with the great number of people who want to join them. Organizing meetings are held, ministers settled, new buildings erected, and a Sunday School and congregation of several hundred gathered, often without any large number of those who participate knowing any more about the Christian church than what they had gleaned from *Life* magazine and *Reader's Digest*. Governing boards of new churches sometimes consist of people who have had a great deal more experience with the

Boy Scouts, the U. S. Army, and college fraternities than with the Christian church.

In such an atmosphere it is no wonder that some rather bizarre activities are held under the banner of the church. Women's societies may even escape the dragnet of the national denominational scheme for yearly mission emphasis, and plan a whole year's program around the free movies and demonstrations made available by commercial concerns. A movie on "How Excelsior Chemicals Are Made" may be separated from the meeting with the lady demonstrator of Super Duper Vitamin Tested Aluminum Sheet Cook Ware only by an inspirational talk on Prayer by the minister's wife.

Churches with established memberships are not necessarily secure from wandering in fields far from Christian truth, but the lack of pressure on them often means they follow denomination and traditional program ideas as the easiest way of doing things.

This role of denominational pressure in building local church program must also be noted. Most denominational program planning and promotion boards are determined to organize the local church so that it will be: (a) well informed about the denominational missionary program; (b) efficient in raising its local budget and missionary giving through carefully tested plans; (c) comprehensive in closely graded Christian education for children; (d) enthusiastic but well disciplined in increasing the number of church members. There is

no question about the deep dedication and sincerity with which denominational leaders press themselves into the building of over-all campaigns, crusades, themes, and emphases year after year. Indeed, the output of slick paper brochures, turn-over charts, posters, pledge cards, and manuals by all the major denominations added together would make an impressive pile in the midst of an advertising agency office. Despite the sincerity of the efforts and the orthodox piety of the language, one gets the impression that this gigantic sales job may seem very different in the Christian churches in the back country of Georgia or the plains of Nebraska from what was intended in New York or Philadelphia or Cleveland. Mass produced programs to evangelize America, or put out an Every Member Canvass Plan in Every Church may miss by a mile serving the purposes of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, one very articulate layman in a smart Connecticut town dumped a whole packet on his pastor's desk one day, and, declared, with feeling, "I'm done with the church if it doesn't stop swallowing Madison Avenue junk like everyone else."

There is then the restraining function of the Word of God upon the program plans of the local church. But there is also the much more important energizing role. Here is the area where the faithful planning and creative imagination of the members is of first importance. After all, *koinonia* is a gift by grace from God

and cannot be built. No group of people can constitute themselves the body of Christ. But both things are possible through God's action when men and women assemble to hear the Word of God and join together in the sacraments. These are the banks of the channel of God's grace which men must tend.

The most difficult part about it, however, is for people to accept the reality of a given Word of God, if it is not presented as literal Biblicalism or the pronouncements of an infallible church. That is why the resurgence of biblical theology in our day is of so much significance to churches that have a Reformation heritage. For, like our fathers before us, we have discovered that the Bible is the most authentic vessel of the Word of God. We have come through strenuous decades of the most minute dissection of the text and background of the Scriptures, to discover that the Word that is written here shines with greater clarity than ever before. More than that, the message of an undivided Word—God creating and redeeming men—transcends all the variety represented by the differences in time and occasion when the various books were written.

There is this given Word, then, of a God in covenant with his people and making the covenant incarnate in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, who lives forever. This is the test question that must be asked, "Does what we are doing testify to the living Christ?" More than that, the Bible provides almost infinite detail and

variation as to the implications of this test. We are not left with a category or a proposition from which didactic material must be deduced. We are given a kingdom of human experience with divine grace to enlighten us and encourage us.

PRACTICE

In the local church, the authority of the Word of God must be seen foremost in relation to the corporate worship of the people and the teaching ministry of the church.

The most encouraging thing about the increasing interest in religion in America, is that church attendance is rising, even in the face of increased radio and TV religious programs. Despite the mixture of reasons why this is so, surely one of the most important is that people find something in the gathering of themselves together to worship God that cannot be duplicated anywhere else. Here this zeal for uniqueness of experience noted in the first chapter is not misplaced. And the churches must not fail to insure careful stewardship of this most precious gift, the Word of God broken open in words and sign. The worst temptation to the church as far as worship is concerned is to think of it as essentially a time for subjective rumination. Christian worship is exactly the opposite of this. It is action and deed, in which the power of God's grace is poured out in preaching and sacrament and to which the people respond in

repentance, thanksgiving, and commitment. We have been taught through long years of preoccupation with the nineteenth century ideology of the Will, that worship is a preparation for life. That is, that we gird ourselves for the real battle by talking ideals to ourselves and pressing our thoughts toward courageous deeds. May it not be that life is a preparation for worship? That is, that the daily deed of earning bread and the holy deed of waiting upon the Lord in company with his church flow in together. One is not rehearsal for the other. The worship of the Christian church must have this sturdiness about it that comes from a frequent mixture of the earthy problems of life with the promises of the Most Holy God.

It is interesting to note the significant liturgical movements now going on within the various branches of Christendom. Those churches which have always maintained their ties with the historic fabric of Christian liturgy going back to the first century, but which had lost the spontaneity and liveness of that first century are rediscovering it to some extent. This is signalized by the new emphasis on preaching in churches where the sermon has been allowed to wither away into hortatory remarks. Also there is the replacement of the altar with its back affixed to the wall by the older free standing table of the Lord, symbolizing the fact that the sacrament is valid only when surrounded by the people of God, in the midst of the believers.

Those churches which are heirs of the left wing of the Reformation, and for two centuries have prized the preached word over anything else, are rediscovering their own legitimate liturgical heritage. This is a heritage which sees the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as one of the two great centers of worship. Often this sacrament had degenerated into a mere memorial meal in which Jesus was revered and remembered, but which was dependent for its efficacy upon the emotional state of those attending.

Historic Christian worship has an irreducible pattern of essentials which has an integrity of its own. There are two root sources of this pattern, the synagogue service of attendance upon the reading and hearing of the Law, and the upper-room supper of the Lord. In the first-generation church these two acts of corporate worship were separate services, but within the first century they came together into one service. This service, however, had two distinct parts. The first was the liturgy of the word, in which Scripture was read and expounded, and prayers of confession, thanksgiving, and intercession were said. The second part was the liturgy of the faithful in which Holy Communion was observed. Through the centuries many changes have taken place to exalt one part or the other of this old unity, and doctrinal differences within Christendom have considerably modified the simple movement of the service. Yet Christian worship is barren without

this full-orbed pattern—which includes the breaking open of the Scripture in prophetic preaching, prayers of adoration, of confession, thanksgiving, and intercession, in which the people share, and the administration of the sacraments. It may not be feasible to have Communion every Sunday, but a frequent observance is necessary, and even on the occasions when it is not held, the congregation still is reminded of its normative position through the offertory and prayers of intercession.

One of the stubborn obstacles to vital worship in many churches is the unspoken assumption that a worship service is a program or a performance to be observed. People come without any specific understanding of their role except that they are hopeful that something will be said or done that will move them or interest them.

There is need to recapture that sense of movement, of drama, in which the congregation has an important function of response and participation in order to make the whole service an offering to God. To this end, the restoration of congregational singing as one of the major ways in which the congregation responds to the Word, and offers up its praise, is long overdue. An anthem by the choir, no matter how skilled, can never substitute for the hymn. Evelyn Underhill, writing about the genius of early Lutheran worship, says this:

The preacher may scatter the Word; but the chorale gathers the faithful together around the treasure of life which it contains, and breaks down as nothing else can do, the isolation of the soul. One might almost say that the chorale creates the Protestant congregation.¹

When a congregation understands that it has a deed to perform together when it worships, then it can become eagerly attendant to that which God offers in the service. The minister, understanding this, is driven back to confront more seriously the stewardship he undertakes when he preaches from the Word and administers the sacrament.

Preaching that is rigorously faithful to the central biblical themes of creation, judgment, redemption, and resurrection, is one of the great needs of the American church. This kind of preaching must not be equated with philosophical treatises upon doctrine, but saturated with all the imagination that is necessary to really break open these themes at the points where people may feed on them. The starting point, however, is the biblical message and not the current enthusiasm of the minister.

If the Lord's Supper is indeed the Word made visible, we must learn to come to it with eye open and heart unlatched. The table of the Lord is not the place to indulge in gymnastics of rationalization. It is a time

¹ Evelyn Underhill, *Worship* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937), p. 279. Used by permission.

for solemnity and reverent fear of God, certainly, but it is overwhelmingly a time of joy and satisfaction when we receive the holy elements which mediate the unspeakable grace of God. "Lift up your hearts." "We lift them to the Lord."

When the bread is broken, and the cup poured out, a deed is done that declares the everlasting efficacy of God's work in the gift of Christ. Here, gathered with our neighbors and brethren, we cannot escape the impact of Paul's charge that we are the body of Christ. For is this not his body broken for us, and his blood poured out for the remission of our sins?

Baptism, the other sacrament of reformed Christendom, is equally a nonverbal illustration of God's grace, as a person is received into the household of faith. Whether it is given in infancy, and confirmed in childhood, or administered at an age of decision in childhood, it is still a sign of God's initiative and man's acceptance of that act.

If the corporate worship of the congregation is indeed an objective act with its own integrity, then it behooves a people to resist fanciful embroidering of the service. This does not mean that art and decoration should not be used as servants to this work of worship. It does mean, however, that they should be servants. Aesthetic judgments should never be the sole nor the determinative judgments in the ordering of the service or the decorating of the church.

We are dismayed by some of the architectural horrors that were built as churches fifty years ago. We are continuing to build, at an accelerated rate, bright new buildings, many of which will be so regarded twenty-five years hence. This is because congregations do not themselves understand the full purpose of their worship, so they do not insist that the architects they employ spend some time in theological consultation.

The authority of the Word, however, is not limited to the public services of worship. All the other activities of the church must measure their purposes against it. The teaching ministry of the church must particularly be conscious of what is centrally to be taught and the urgency of its message. The curriculum of the church school has been particularly vulnerable over the years to the vagaries of secular educational theory. Desiring the best educational methods, church educators often adopted an implicit metaphysics of naturalism as a part of the method. This tendency has certainly been recognized in recent years, and nearly all the major denominations have recast their church school curriculums so that the gospel is clearly presented as well as the best educational theory consulted.

The area where there is least being done, and perhaps the greatest need exists, is in adult education in the church. The continuous opening up of the gospel to the members of the church in ways that are appropriate ought to be one of the major tasks of the church

program. It is too true that adults in many churches of our country never meet together except for Sunday worship or in organizational meetings largely devoted to the business of running the church. The complaint is often heard that we do not give new church members enough things to do to keep them interested. The partial truth in this observation, however, is overridden by the fact that we never give them any opportunity to discuss the central meaning of the faith they have espoused in a formal setting.

One of the clues to the reason that this is true is the frequent failure of the more formal adult religious education. With rare exception, adult Sunday School classes are considered by the average layman to be opportunities in the church he does not particularly desire. The decline of the midweek meeting is due, of course, to the increased pressure of daily life, but also to the deadly stereotyped procedure which it often followed.

Perhaps it is time to launch a new kind of adult education based on informal small groups meeting together to study a given body of material for a stated length of time. Many churches are finding this a means to teach laymen who have always shied away from more formal setups, and also to give the opportunity for the growth of close personal acquaintanceship between members on the level of deep concerns.

Three kinds of groups ought to exist in the church.

One kind is a basic orientation study class which is frankly to lay out the main doctrines of the Christian church. This may very well be done in a more formal setting, although even here, it is better when people feel uncoerced by the habits of their childhood, and can speak freely and honestly.

Second, in addition to the survey course, study groups concentrating on one specific area of doctrine, like the nature of man, Jesus Christ, Christian ethics, or on the thought of one theologian, are valuable. Such a group should meet for a definitely scheduled period of time, for example, six weeks, and then be reconstituted.

The third kind of group begins not so much with doctrine, but with the revelatory literature of our own times, such as plays, novels, nonfiction documentaries. Study that begins in such an area often permits people to speak more freely about their real feelings and questions. Theological insight then comes in response to these questions and in dialogue with the real dynamics of modern life.

It would seem that the opening of the Word of the Christian heritage in theology and in art, drama, and literature, must become an important manifesto for the whole program of the church. Organizations which exist because of old loyalties may very well be filled with new purpose if they are seen as opportunities of teaching and for exposure to Christian culture. So

much of the emotional energies which belong to the important area of man's aesthetic appreciation is drained off in the fantastic world of mass entertainment in our day. We need to introduce into our churches a competence that will help them to make discriminating Christian judgments and bring Christian appreciation to the religiously significant aspects of our culture. It is not a secondary matter that third-rate illustration and art forms in so many churches and adoption of the cheapest kind of television entertainment are the major forms borrowed from the world of the lively arts.

Concentration on study in the field of theology and culture need not be highbrow or pretentious. Perhaps one of the surest ways to the redevelopment of a self-conscious Christian community within a pluralistic culture is the training of knowing laymen who can make theological judgments. In a speech before the Knights of Columbus, Seventy-fourth Supreme Convention on August 21, 1956, the Most Rev. Alexander M. Zaleski, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, told the group that the love of study must be one of the major duties of Catholic laymen. He told them that they must be "men of study and research."

Richard Niebuhr, in his report submitted to the Secretariat for Evangelism of the World Council of Churches on *Who Are the Unbelievers and What Do They Believe?* writes:

The rate of religious and particularly Christian illiteracy in a population that by and large regards itself as Christian is very high. Little biblical knowledge can be counted upon among church members and non members alike. The Christian faith is intimately connected with a theology that the Church teaches something relatively specific about God, man and the future; that Christianity is not only belief but understanding in the light of belief; not only a code of ethics but an orientation in nature and history. . . .²

To the end that Christians may find the measure of their separateness and the direction of their mission, the authority of the Word of God must rule the Church.

² H. Richard Niebuhr, *Who Are the Unbelievers and What Do They Believe?* Report from the Survey on Evangelism, p. 36, published in *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955). By permission of the U. S. Conference for the World Council of Churches.

CHAPTER IV

No Salvation Outside the Church and Evangelism

EPISODE

"You know, I like that guy," Joe Martinson acknowledged to his two friends across the corner of the bar where they were standing. Joe was assistant to the leader of the West End Political Club which had its headquarters upstairs. He was talking about the Rev. Henry Bates, who had just left them. Tony and Clem nodded and savored their beer.

"And the boss likes him, too," Joe went on to say. "Can you imagine him listening to a preacher about what's good for this precinct? You know how he hates that do-gooder bunch which always meets over at the library. But this Bates, he's something else again."

"What's he want to see the Boss about this time, Joe?" Tony asked.

"He's got an idea about forming some sort of job-sponsoring committee for the kids who quit school, or

get back from the Army, or are out on parole. He wants the Boss to get the business men in the Club to take up the idea. I guess he'd like some co-operation from the D.A.'s office too."

"You think the Boss will buy the idea, Joe?" Tony asked.

"Hell, I don't know. But Bates don't ever bother him with just any old idea. He knows what the Boss will think is good politics as well as good for people. He's a smart cookie."

Clem spoke for the first time. "What's his racket, Joe? I mean, what's he after? Nobody works that hard for just nothing."

Joe asked, "What do you mean, Clem? He's a preacher. He's supposed to help people."

Clem explained, "You know what I mean. He isn't like any of the other preachers around here. Why, that old mission has been standing on that corner ever since we were kids, and nobody ever saw the other preachers around the neighborhood, except talking to the kids or old ladies. They spent all their time running basketball leagues and preaching and praying, or something. Now, all of a sudden during the last four years this guy Bates is hanging around down at Flaminsky's Garage, and coming in here, and getting cozy with the Boss. I don't get it."

"I tell you he's just a good guy, Clem. I think he does those things because he likes to. I got to admit he used

to make me pretty uncomfortable. It gives you kind of a chill to have a preacher around when you want to let loose and relax."

Tony spoke up, "Yeah, what's the problem, Clem? What are you suspicious of?"

"Well, look at the whole thing, you guys. It isn't just Bates. There are three or four guys joined the club last year who are members of that mission church. And I even heard that Gus Mikelson and his family are going to that church. He's an old-time club member. Why is that mission suddenly so interested in politics, and in guys like hang out down at Flaminsky's?"

Joe went back to the cigarette machine, and when he came back he moved in between Tony and Clem on the short side of the bar, where he could see out the window.

"You think Bates is trying to convert us or something?" he asked. Through the window he could see the minister standing on the front steps of the mission in earnest conversation with a young couple.

"Well, why else does he spend so much time with people who don't go to that mission, and with people who aren't even of his religion, or any religion at all, for that matter? You say he don't want to take over the club. We all know he's not running a racket. He's out to save our souls."

Tony looked uncertainly from Joe to Clem. He gen-

erally believed what Joe said about everything. But what Clem said sounded convincing. Still, he tried a halfhearted protest. "But he never talks religion. He's never passed me no tract. Are you sure, Clem?"

Joe reacted angrily, "Of course he's not sure. You're just suspicious of everyone, Clem. Why, wouldn't I know if some preacher was working me over? Wouldn't the Boss know?"

This silenced all three of them for a few minutes, but each had his own thoughts. These all had something to do with Henry Bates, but even more to do with a shrugged-off religion, and a mixture of fear and anger that maybe someone was really trying to invade that forbidden area of their lives.

Henry Bates walked down the street with the couple. They left him at the corner and, as he returned to the mission, he waved at the men in the bar.

"Smile at the padre, Joe. You'll be a deacon in his church some day," Clem said.

"Shut up, damn you, Clem. That guy's my friend. He's got no leash hidden behind his back for me."

"I don't think you can ever trust them completely. If you're a good Christian, wouldn't you have to believe that everybody outside the church is damned? Wouldn't you be working all the time to get everybody to join?"

Tony looked anxiously from one to the other.

DOCTRINE

Is there salvation outside the church? Or in other words, are the decisive matters of ultimate relationship between men and God unalterably restricted to the dominion of the church? This is crucial because the cosmopolitan nature of our times makes it incomprehensible to moderns that this frail segment of society should be "the sphere of justification and the realm of redemption." Churchmen themselves, anxious lest our world discount the character of God on the basis of the poor stewardship of the church, are not willing to give an unqualified "no" to the question. On the other hand, the Scripture plainly indicates that the way of reconciliation with God is completely in and through Christ and not in the great undistributed abundance of general providence.

"No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him. . ." (John 6:44)

"I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matthew 16:19)

If the church is the body of Christ, in *any* essential way, then for better or for worse, this is where men must look for the reception of the grace of God.

This dilemma has led to prolonged speculation in all the centuries since the Reformation about the visible

and invisible Church. For surely all that is known to the experiences of men in church life does not exhaust the opportunities that God provides in Christ for the world. And yet just as surely, to begin to define these other areas of the sure presence of the indwelling Christ outside the Church is to court a presumptuous pantheism. The words "visible" and "invisible" have had different meanings to various traditions. To the Lutherans, visibility and invisibility were thought to apply to the same church at various times. That is, here the stuff of the great Church of God is truly a part of the life of this community of belief, and here there is a barren time when it is as if the essence of what makes the Church had gone underground. However, the power of the Church is always latent even if "hidden" or invisible.

In the Reformed tradition the distinction is much more closely related to time. The visible church refers to the existing, living fellowship, while the term "the invisible Church" is reserved for the communion of saints, the Church in all places and all ages.

One thing is certain, that whenever the church centers its attention on drawing exact lines, as to who is included within the sphere of God's grace and who is excluded from it, it travels a dangerous road.

It is necessary to begin to take the doctrine of election seriously and to see what it is saying essentially. The Reformed emphasis on election was far removed

from setting earthly measures of who qualifies for God's favor and who is beyond the pale. This is sometimes what happened as a derivative result. The main thrust of Calvin's doctrine of election, however, was that the lines of grace were completely in the hands of God. This did not mean that he was a capricious God, one who established his way of reconciliation through his Son, and then flaunted his own covenant with the church. But the initiative and the surety of any man's ultimate encounter with the Almighty lay with the Almighty.

What then of the good man, or the man struggling with the fundamental questions of life and death, who cannot see the church on the corner as having anything to offer in this struggle? And what then of the man without faith who finds himself a pillar of the local church because of custom and environment? Even more crucial, what is the basic drive of evangelism, if it is not to confront men with the decisive importance of Christ in their lives—lives within the church?

These questions can be faced only in the light of an understanding of the meaning of salvation which is both dynamic and theological. A typographical error in the first draft of the manuscript of this chapter illustrates the difficulty of such an understanding. The title was first typed as "No Solution Outside the Church." Too frequently we have come to think of salvation as heavenly bookkeeping—a rational assur-

ance of an eternal safe conduct pass. Rather salvation is best understood dynamically in relation to saving health—the content and fruit of a life rooted in faith. Thus, to assert that there is no ultimate salvation outside the church is to assert the power of God through the Holy Spirit in the community of those who believe.

CULTURE

There are few things more offensive to the respectable, well-situated American than the feeling that he is being evangelized. It is an affront to the notion that democracy means that everyone's traditional religious heritage is equal to that of everyone else. Evangelization, in addition, always appears to the unevangelized as an occasion in which someone is going to try to alter one's inner life, to make an assault on a façade that has been carefully maintained. Christian evangelism is linked in the public mind with violent revivalism, and excessive public display of emotion which ends in compliant submission to a pious life of no drinking, no smoking, no profanity. Even when a representative of the church does not seem to epitomize this picture, he is suspected of putting on a disguise in order to catch people off their guard.

No aspect of the church's life has become more of a caricature or has fallen into more rigidity of expression than its evangelistic efforts. Revivalism developed a pattern of customs and inflexible traditions that are

familiar to everyone. The reaction against revivalism and the search for alternatives have produced just as heavyhanded methods. Visitation evangelism is widely hailed as "the" alternative to revivalism, and is accepted as such by most of the denominations. What does this mean in practice? It is a carefully devised plan for making calls on families not related officially to the church, to seek their membership. Now no one will quarrel with the necessity for church people to engage in regular visitation upon their neighbors. However, there is basic confusion in the literature of visitation evangelism concerning the purpose of these calls. The preamble and stated purpose of the plan inevitably talks about saving the lost, making an assault upon unbelief so that men may know Christ as Lord and Savior. When the details of how "the call" is to be made are outlined, however, it usually seems to be in terms of "selling" church membership on any basis that seems appealing to the customer. The final steps in a "Road Map of an Evangelistic Interview" are outlined below:

6. Advance the appeal. This is somewhat like prescribing for the patient after you have seen the symptoms. In your period of exploration you have been thinking about what appeal you believe will most effectively reach this person. An appeal is a reaction or a motivation for accepting the Christian faith. Generally speaking, there are four classes of appeals. They are to be used *one at a time*, never all together. To do so only

confuses the issue. If it is apparent that you missed the boat in picking the first one, abandon it completely. Don't mention it again. Try another. You will rarely have time for more than two. Make your choice wisely. Helpful appeals for beginning the Christian life are these:

- A. The appeal to *Conscience*. "Does it not seem to you that you *ought* to be a Christian?"
- B. The appeal to the *Christian Home*. "You have told me about the Christian home in which you were reared. Does it not seem that you ought to give your children the same chance that you had?"
- C. The appeal to *Service*. This is useful to people of obvious gifts and abilities.
- D. The appeal on the basis of *World Conditions*. This is useful to those who seem to have a lively sense of what is going on in the world.

Visit with some leisure of spirit about the appeal under discussion. Give your prospects time. Don't argue, certainly not theological fine points. Leave that for the experts.

7. Close the interview carefully. Only experience can tell you when it is time to close. Once you have seen it, you will not miss it. Proper use of the Commitment Card makes this easy.
8. Pray. Every successful interview ends at the foot of the Cross.¹

¹ "Road Map of an Evangelistic Interview," by Harold B. Williams, *Shepherds* (magazine), Nashville, Tenn., Summer, 1956. By permission of the editor.

Such appeals would seem to be less than they ought to be on two grounds:

First, they do not really seem to be based on a belief that the church is *the* sphere of justification and salvation. There is no compelling sense of urgency about such a presentation of the gospel. Underlying this approach is the modus of salesmanship technique in which the assumption is implicit that the "product" is not really necessary in its own right to the person, but can perhaps be made to seem so.

In fact, most appeals to churchmanship are tuned to the comparative mood in adjectives. The Religion in American Life, which is an interdenominational and interfaith promotion program backed by the Advertising Council of America, uses as its current slogan (on billboards, postcards, bumpers, letterheads, stickers, menus, and posters), "Build a *stronger, richer* life. . . . Worship together every week."

What of the life that knows there is no strength in it? What of the life that cannot comprehend its own poverty because it is so surfeited? Thus there is a kind of empty carton of clichés, new and old, that is peddled in the name of evangelism. Where is the Christ of Gethsemane and Calvary? Where is the offer of divine forgiveness that makes all the difference in the world?

Probably it is not discussed in the evangelism manuals, because of the second appalling weakness in our evangelism attempts. That is, there is no under-

standing of the complex interweaving of post-Christian wistfulness, outright paganism, and pseudo religiosity that makes up the thinking and living of our time. If men and women in the church themselves do not really believe that the church is a divine act, what empowers them to be evangelists in its behalf? They can be no more than salesmen for its sterling qualities. They must reduce evangelism to the simple transaction of getting more members with the pious hope that "something" will happen to these people once they become regular attendants.

If churchmen really do stake their lives on the church, then they are freer to admit her weakness and corruption—to marvel at her power despite "the storm without and the stench within." They are also freer to become really involved in the problems of the world outside the church and to be witnesses to the incarnate Christ instead of salesmen impatient to ring two more doorbells this evening; for true evangelism is a delicate and time-consuming art in our day. If we proceed on the assumption that we still live in a world that is really Christendom but with small spots of disaffection and secularism, then a snappy talk about the benefits of church membership is in order. However, if we realize that Christendom no longer exists, but only small isolated islands of Christian culture which float in the vast sea of every kind of human passion, then witnessing to Christ becomes a lifetime job of the most

intense kind of identification with the people outside the church. This kind of evangelism knows that the communication between men in our day is becoming excruciating and desperate unsucces. Old catch phrases are worse than useless. They set up barriers that can never be surmounted. Only men and women who are willing to open their own personal lives to others in ways that may cause embarrassment or invite abuse, in absolute candor, and frank humanity, can be evangelists for the church in our day. We cannot point to the all-sufficient Christ, if there is the slightest hint that we think we have managed to co-opt a little of that sufficiency and are willing to pass it on. We cannot talk about the depth of human sin to which Christ comes with forgiveness, if we are not willing to acknowledge our own weakness and sin to others.

D. T. Niles says it precisely:

Evangelism is witness. It is one beggar telling another beggar where to get food. The Christian does not offer out of his bounty. He has no bounty. The evangelistic relation is to be "alongside of" not "over-against." The Christian stands alongside the non Christian and points to the Gospel, the holy action of God.²

Such a conception of evangelism knows that the incidence of failure to success will be very high. More

² Daniel T. Niles, *That They May Have Life*, published for the Student Volunteer Movement for Christian Missions (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), p. 96. By permission of Harper & Brothers.

than that, it comprehends the irony that the stern reasons that keep many people out of the church are reflections of a very high view of the church. Some people will not settle for an institutional credit card as far as the church is concerned. They are on a search, a desperate journey for truth that will not be satisfied by dead monuments to truth. Tennessee Williams presents such a group of people in his play, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Here are a father and son, the older one successful in the world because he has never for a moment confused truth with convention and public manners, and the young man an alcoholic wreck before he is thirty because he had not been able to accept the distinction. The father says at one point:

“...the human animal is a beast that dies and if he’s got money he buys and buys and buys and I think the reason he buys everything he can buy is that in the back of his mind he has the crazy hope that one of his purchases will be life everlasting!”³

Evangelism has to come to terms with the honest doubts of people outside the church that are often more appropriate offerings to God than the protestations of piety within.

Julian Hartt writes, in *Toward a Theology of Evangelism*:

³ P. 73, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, by Tennessee Williams. Copyright 1955 by Tennessee Williams and reprinted by permission of the publisher, New Directions.

The God whom it is wisdom to fear has powerful and courageous witnesses outside the church. To encounter this God and to be engaged with him is a deadly serious matter. And from this moral engagement comes a fierce contempt for the genteel and conventional demigods of our day—those companionable household deities of a people withdrawn as far as humanly possible from the raw frontiers of existence. These demigods are ubiquitous. In richly carpeted and decorous funeral parlors they whisper soothingly. They flit and flicker in our minds when disaster overtakes us, and they seduce us with comfortable and ingratiating sentiments. When we despair, they whisper that every cloud has a silver lining. When we would sit in sackcloth and cover our heads with ashes for our sins, they gently reprove us for thinking more poorly of ourselves than we ought to think. These demigods of the mist have been our companions and our masters; and in their service we have hoped to find peace of mind. But when the chips are down, half-gods evaporate. And the chips are down. If we people of the church are only vaguely aware that this is so, it is perhaps because the demigods still confuse and bedazzle us. In this respect the “heathen” in our midst may be more mature religiously than we are. When this is so, evangelism has its problems—among the targets of the program must be truly inspired atheists who know that half-gods do not exist.⁴

⁴ From *Toward a Theology of Evangelism* by Julian N. Hartt. Copyright 1955 by Pierce & Washabaugh. By permission of Abingdon Press.

With all this, the evangelist has to keep close to the church, knowing that God is at work there, and that he will never leave himself without witnesses.

In a seminar held recently, a brilliant Christian philosopher was expounding with telling effectiveness the lethargy and hypocrisy that had finally driven him out of the ministry. He went on to describe the pain and loneliness that he felt when he had been forced by conviction to leave the comfortable pastorate of the organized church. He even spoke of the Cross in relation to this powerful experience. One of the members of the seminar was one of the wisest Christian statesmen of our country. Finally, he could contain himself no longer. He said in effect, "You speak of the Cross. The greatest Cross I know is to stay inside the church—to contend daily with its halting halfheartedness, and its equivocation. And yet, to know that it is necessary to stay and be faithful because this is Christ's body."

PRACTICE

How does a church organize its life for outreach into the community? The first step is a negative one; that is, to resist the temptation of keeping so much activity going inside the walls that there is no time to look outward. The second step is the development of an awareness of parish responsibility—a continuing sense of identification with the common life of

the geographical community in which it is set. At this point, evangelism and social action become the same process. There is no more potent evangelistic witness in a community than the church's concern and action on behalf of justice or in the meeting of some critical human need. We must remember that we prize a good deal about love and compassion and justice. Therefore, when the opportunity to exercise these virtues in a community crisis is ignored, the silent witness is deafening. What has been wrong with much of our social action projects in the church is the same that has characterized our evangelism efforts. The projects have been short term and often highly hortatory about somebody else's sins. A community is not fooled by highly publicized efforts to be the Good Samaritan on the corner. If the people of a congregation are not regularly identified with school problems, community planning, recreation, discrimination in housing, and identified as completely concerned about the people who suffer because of these problems, then no one is impressed by high-sounding calls to citizenship from the pulpit one Sunday before election. There is a strong tradition both within the church and in the community that the church must not mix in politics. Somehow this is a doctrine badly derived from our legitimate heritage to keep church and state separate. The early church certainly did not feel that the church was excluded from political and civic involvement. Wherever

the problems of citizenship impinged upon God's loving will for men, then a witness had to be made. Ernest Wright, in *The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society*, writes:

The Christian attitude toward the Roman state varied in the New Testament, ranging from absolute condemnation to approval and cooperation. Both extremes seem to be present in every period. (For example, in approximately the same time that Revelation pictures the Roman Empire as a Satanic beast or blasphemous harlot, in which there is no positive value, Clement of Rome composes a beautiful prayer for political rulers in which he says, "Give them, Lord, health, peace, concord, stability, in order that they may administer without offence the Government that has been given them by Thee.")⁵

The church must have a regular opportunity to face its witnessing and serving responsibility. The minister can surely preach about it, or a social action committee can study it, but these are only preparatory steps to the church as a whole *facing* it. In a small church, there should be regular church meetings, not to conduct routine business, but to discuss the corporate life of the church and the needs and opportunities of the community. Very often the church is the last agency in a community to know about special problems, and often the only relationship the church has to neigh-

⁵ G. Ernest Wright, *The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society*, London: SCM Press, Ltd., p. 149. By permission of the publisher.

borhood concerns is for the minister to give the invocation at the meeting where everyone else is bent on action. The church ought to be the first group in the community to spot areas of crisis, whether these be in terms of housing problems or intangible tension between groups. There is a long road between taking action in such areas and becoming "politically partisan," which is always the big fear. Indeed, there may be times when the situation demands partisan political stands. This is not beyond the realm of the claim of the gospel. But there are so many places short of that, where the church must speak and act in the community, that to raise it is to throw sand into the discussion.

In large churches, the problem is made more difficult by the awkwardness of getting a consensus. Here a social action committee, working closely with the spiritual leaders of the church, may very well be authorized by the church to wield discretionary powers in relation to the social witness of the church in the community.

Parish responsibility, of course, is not limited to concern for social problems in which people happen to be involved. An intimate knowledge of the personal lives of people who live in the parish is necessary. Thus, social action never becomes an abstract "issue" which the church has no business espousing. Social problems and personal problems are related to specific people who are known by name, and who are of direct con-

cern to the church. Church people, in such a concern, see their friends and neighbors as people among whom they are set to serve. The Iona Community and the East Harlem Protestant Parish have done much in the last decade to demonstrate how this is the central principle of building church program. Instead of starting with a syllabus of emphases or projects from among which they would choose points of action, they have always begun with the immediate, aching need of the people among whom they live. It is perhaps easier to see these points of human need in economically depressed areas, but this does not mean that the principle is not the soundest one for all churches to follow in their relationships to the community. This means that clergymen and laymen must be available and accessible to the community as a whole. This does not mean simply publishing in the newspaper the hours when people may be counseled in the church study. The people who seek out such help probably need it, but they are not necessarily the ones who need it the most, or are really most open to the inbreaking of the Word of God. The minister and people must be willing to be accessible in social and informal occasions and to be looking for opportunities to make a witness. This does not mean preparing a canned speech for lulls in the conversation at parties. Rather it means developing the kind of compassionate understanding and defenseless humanness to which people will instinctively turn.

The whole matter of the Christian life which supposedly makes a witness without uttering a word is often reduced to inanities. Christians don't give off a special neon glow which other people can detect, all the third points of ministers' sermons to the contrary notwithstanding. If they do, it is as likely to be conscious self-righteousness which people can pick out certainly, but not with the evangelistic results desired. Rather than letting church people brighten the corner where they are or the midcentury equivalent, we should help them to understand themselves and others with the basic realism of the Christian view of man. Contemporary psychology has given us many tools at this point which can be appropriated for our understanding of the feelings and sensitivities of ourselves and others. It is true that superficial understanding in this area in the hands of apprehensive or defensive people can be used to hurt as well as to help others. However, a man or woman who "accepts his acceptance by God," and has an appreciation of his own sin and pride, *does* communicate this to others in ways that are below the level of the verbal. A church that has in its membership a number of people who are sure of their salvation—that is, they know in the depth of their being that God has loved them and is with them despite their unworthiness—has true evangelists in its midst. These people may not necessarily be the most articulate, nor the most learned, but these are the

people who really proclaim the Word of God in the community. Such folk in the normal and often informal contacts of the parish are the gates through which the secretly anxious and wistfully hungry souls can enter the church.

It would seem that such opportunities and such a responsibility ought to occupy a great deal of the time of the minister. Nevertheless, many churches resent the minister's giving much time to anything that does not seem immediately related to promoting the church or ministering to those already members. The heart of being an evangelistic church does not reside in any program of promotion ever devised, but in the interest and affection of a church for those around it. This affection can never be simulated. It can, however, be stimulated both by the new understanding of human life which comes through Christ and by a sense of the absorbing drama of humanity that is being enacted in the fabric of community life.

True evangelism in our day is closely related to the ability to see beneath the surface of life. Few people seem to have time or the inclination. The old easy explanations of human behavior are accepted whether they be garbed in new pseudo psychological terms or the clichés of class structure. We judge people, and dispose of them in neat categories in the twinkling of an eye. He is aloof because he's absorbed in getting ahead, or she is difficult because she is defensive about

her weight, we say, and then go on to something else. Granting the partial truths that may be present, Christian churchmen must be unwilling to accept these insights as the final word that can be known about anyone. Knowing so much about human behavior, we sometimes seem strangely obtuse to the surprises that lurk in every man. Christian churchmen should be completely unorthodox when it comes to meeting people, getting to know them, helping to break open the old shells that they have worn a long time. This is the heart of evangelism—the Christian gospel of disdain for the superficialities of the exterior. Visitation programs, and other methods, have meaning only if there are churchmen who have such an entree into the human heart.

In addition to a concern that reaches out to the problems and involvements of the physical community, the church must pray for others. This is an area we have taken all too lightly. We have never neglected the omnibus references to all “sorts and conditions” of men, but this was as much the reminding of God that we were not really so selfish, as anything else. Intercessory prayer is one of the most important parts of the worship life of the church. Intercessory prayer means earnest waiting upon the Lord for specific needs. Here the multitude of human relationships that reach out from the church like a network of sensitive wires,

are brought together and held up to God for empowering wisdom.

People should be prayed for by name in the church. Problems should be mentioned specifically. The dying of the old prayer meeting happened when people began to think that intercessory prayer was not valid, and also when it became a time for the display of public piety. There is great need for the re-establishment of special times of intercessory prayer in the life of the church. This, of course, should be a part of the corporate Sunday service, but also at other stated times.

Intercessory prayer for healing, mental and physical healing, must be restored to the church. If God is the redeemer of all of a man's life, then we know through the example of Christ that he is concerned for the body of a man too. Psychosomatic medicine has shamed us into recovering what the ancient church knew to be true—it is impossible to separate sin and mortality, the physical and the eternal.

Like most of the areas of greatest spiritual power, there is attendant upon the healing ministry of the church dangerous heresy and sin. Prayer groups can become sentimental and ingrown. Healing by prayer can become exhibitionistic and an un-Christian exploitation of the misery of the flesh. Both things are very apparent in contemporary Protestantism. This, however, is no reason to avoid the obligation laid upon us by Christ—to preach and teach and heal. Healing

must be seen by the church in the context of the whole mission of the church—the offering of the love of God which knows no boundaries and at the same time defies all human attempts to domesticate it and control it for our own ends.

Fundamentally, to be a church that offers salvation to a neighborhood means to be unafraid. That is, it means casting out fear of losing face, or of failing to be successful. It means taking seriously the life of Christ. He loved life. He was not shocked by anyone. He never confused the word for the deed. He felt no awe for custom and yet no need to be violently set against tradition. His humanity was the vessel of his divine love.

CHAPTER V

The Kingdom of God and How the Church Lives in It

EPISODE

Uncle Harry's not a missionary now.

Noel Coward's recorded voice rose strongly up the stairwell, and Marian Hillsworth visibly flinched.

"Why must they play that record eighteen hours a day?" she said to her husband, who was shaving in the adjoining bathroom. She was sorting through a dresser drawer, trying to find two white gloves that matched to lend to her daughter.

"I suppose they find it very appropriate," Henry Hillsworth said through the lather. The Hillsworths were dressing to go to a special evening service at the church, where their son-in-law and daughter were to be commissioned as missionaries to Africa.

"The whole thing has so many ridiculous undertones, that this flippant record just seems to dramatize it," Marian said.

"Well, you must admit it's consistent with everything else Tom has done since he married Ellen," her husband said.

"You know, the most irritating thing," he continued as he came into the bedroom, "is how charming everyone else finds him. They don't seem to see the irresponsibility that is his most obvious characteristic. And I suppose that's all Ellen ever sees, his charm, I mean."

"You'd think she'd see it, particularly since he's just thrown away one of the best opportunities any young engineer ever had. At least you said it was that kind of job," Marian replied.

The music grew louder.

Poor Uncle Harry,
After a chat with dear Aunty Mary,
Thought the time had come to make a row.
He lined up all the older girls
In one of the local sheds,
And while he was reviling them
And tearing himself to shreds,
They took their mother hubbards off
And tied them around their heads.
Uncle Harry's not a missionary now.
He's awfully happy,
But he's certainly not a missionary now! ¹

¹ "Uncle Harry," from *Noel Coward at Las Vegas*, Columbia Masterworks record ML 5063. Copyright © by Chappell & Co. Ltd., used by permission.

"For heaven's sake, let's go downstairs, and then maybe they'll stop playing that thing," Henry said.

"You know, Henry, there's one thing about this I don't understand," Marian said as she gathered up her purse and the gloves for Ellen.

"What?"

"What is the church coming to, when it accepts kids like that as missionaries? Why, in my childhood, I remember the missionaries that came to our church were always the most impressive men, dignified and . . . and sort of ascetic. Can't you see that big redheaded clown who is our son-in-law in the pulpit?"

She switched off the light for emphasis, and they went downstairs.

The record player was turned off as they entered the living room. Tom Lenreid stood up and asked his wife's parents, "Well, are you as nervous as we are?"

"I don't see why you should be nervous, Tom," his mother-in-law said. "After all, you've moved heaven and earth the last few months to bring this evening to pass. Here are some gloves, Ellen. I hope they'll fit you."

"We're nervous just the same, Mother," Ellen said. "It's not so much going so far away, as it is having everyone act as if we were doing something just a little indecent."

Her mother saw an opportunity to get in one more remark that reflected her displeasure.

"But my dear, if people act that way, it's just that no one ever thought of you and Tom as seriously interested in religion. Oh, we all knew you both were terribly attached to that chaplain in college, but you both seemed so normal and, if I may say so, dear, just a little scatterbrained."

"Mother, I think we ought to have a little talk about this," Tom said. Ellen looked at him with warning in her eyes, because she didn't have the faintest hope of her parents' understanding.

Tom went on anyway.

"We know you both think we're making a mistake about this. You may even be right. We're not 100 per cent sure. But we have to do it. You're wrong about not being very serious about the Christian faith. At least for me, it's the only thing that has ever made any sense to me. I've always been thought of as a kind of perennial Joe College, even before I was old enough to go to college. Mostly, I think this was to cover up my absolute disgust for the way people take things for granted, like growing up in a certain neighborhood, going to a certain school, getting a certain kind of job. You know, even church seemed to belong to this 'business as usual' kind of life, until Ellen and I began going to the study group at the Chapel. We found out there that the gospel had dynamite in it. It lets you know that life can't be bottled up in the genteel and

the respectable. Aw, I can't really explain it to you right."

Ellen tried to help, moved by her husband's speech.

"It's not that we think everybody ought to run off somewhere and be missionaries. But we have to, because we would never be able to stand up against the pressure to conform in that firm where Tom worked. We must *give* something in some place that really needs us, some place where time is running out. The Kingdom doesn't wait."

The Hillsworths were both touched and embarrassed by this sudden theological note.

"But you're both so young, and what about the children you will have? After all, Dr. Botsworth always says in his sermons that we are all building the Kingdom right where we are, here in Chicago. It all seems so wrong, so unorthodox." She sat down and took a clean handkerchief out of her pocket to dry her eyes.

DOCTRINE

What is the Church in relation to the Kingdom of God? This question is related to the preceding one, in that the frailty of the visible church leads us to wonder what the ultimate role for the church is within the full scope of God's redemptive purpose. Jesus undoubtedly uses the idea of the kingdom of God as the encompassing category for the full sovereignty of God over all flesh, and the New Testament writers seem to

extend it logically to include the final perfection of creation itself as a result of God's redeeming act. The theological puzzle surrounding the idea of the Kingdom concerns the immediacy with which the early church expected this fulfillment to take place. Albert Schweitzer restored to our thinking that overwhelming eschatological dimension of the New Testament which deals with the ending of time and last things. All events in the New Testament writings are colored by the expectation that the present structure of sin and evil will be ended by God soon in keeping with the revelation that has come in Christ. The tendency to use this unquestionable truth to discount the permanent validity of the teaching on the basis that the *eschaton* did not come was unfortunate and one-sided. The counterthesis which has been largely framed by C. H. Dodd in recent years is that the hope of the Kingdom had been completely "realized" in the coming of Christ and no future divine event completing the gift of the Christ is indicated. It is interesting that both theses have been used by those who see the kingdom of God as essentially a Utopian ethical ideal, which will be achieved only through the development of the good works of men, and in which there is no need for the consideration of an end to history.

It does seem that both things are true of the kingdom of God as depicted in the New Testament—it is

both fully expressed and present in Christ, and yet not fully sovereign over all the creation. Christians look forward to the final reign of justice and love with real hope because they have beheld Christ. We have within history, through him, the key—yes, more than that—the essential embodiment of God's purpose, but we await the Reign of Christ over all the creation.

Now what part does the Church play in this present and yet to come Kingdom? Because the Church is a community and the Kingdom is surely a society, there is a natural tendency to subsume the Church under the Kingdom as a part of it—a manifestation of it. Indeed, there is the further temptation to equate the Church with the realized Kingdom. That is, to make an equation out of doctrinal ideas—if the Church is the body of Christ, and the Kingdom is manifest in the event of Christ, then the Church is in some way the kingdom of God. Such an oversimplification points out the danger of using doctrine as propositions that can be treated mathematically. For the Church, though it shares intimately in the gifts of the Kingdom through Christ, and through it stands under the judgment, is not the completed Kingdom. The Church is related to the Kingdom in the form of the Servant. It proclaims the Kingdom that has come, and further proclaims the Kingdom that is to come, with urgency and desperate seriousness.

CULTURE

The sense of the apocalyptic—the perspective of a dramatic and culminating fulfillment of prophecy—has largely moved out of the Church to be lodged somewhere else in the culture. The imminent end of the world is still a cornerstone of pentecostal churches, and particularly Jehovah's Witnesses, but it is embodied in such formalistic doctrinaire trappings that only a certain kind of mind sees it as a live option. Eschatological teaching about death, last judgment, and resurrection is very much a part of the body of faith of the Church, and yet it is often without apocalyptic urgency in the Church. The Church itself, with the continuing exception of the pentecostal branches, rarely examines its life in terms of the coming of the Kingdom in its fullness. There is probably no part of the gospel that seems so unnecessary to our churches as hope in the second coming. The reaction of American churches to the theme of the second assembly of the World Council of Churches in Evanston, "Christ, the Hope of the World," was often one of irritation that we should consider anything so esoteric or irrelevant. Again this basic conviction that only the present, the here and now, has any reality, comes into the picture. If we do not believe in the reality of history, we are also impatient with anything that seems like conjecture about the future. Perhaps there is even more resistance to any specula-

tion concerning the future, because of the profound disillusionment of two or more generations who were bred on the belief that the future was a predictable extension of the present. That is, the early part of this century believed with a security hard for us now to imagine, that the age of final enlightenment had come, and that the task of transforming the world into heaven was a matter of determination, time, and good will. Two-and-one-half wars later, there is very little left of this general belief except a residue of a feeling of having been betrayed. Social gospelism as a realized eschatology is as dead in the churches as is optimistic hope about the future of civilization in the secular community.

This is certainly not to say that Americans are filled with despair about the future. They are just unwilling to count on anything beyond the life of their new automatic washer, or next summer's vacation. Politicians talk about building a great new America in campaign oratory in the same speech in which they are pledging themselves to moderation and conservatism. If the mood of America is truly a cautious one—let's hold onto what we've got and be grateful—it is not equivalent to an overwhelming sense of well-being. Observers from abroad continually note our ambivalent way of acting singularly superior and then anxiously complaining because we are afraid other nations don't like us. Perhaps it is a persistent remnant from the Calvin-

ist part of our national heritage that we are from time to time aware that our greatest goodness is not good enough. This Calvinist strain, however, if it be that, has been completely shorn of eschatological meaning. We seem to be saying that if *we* are not good enough, with all the advantages we have had, what then can be counted on? In some ways, the renewed emphasis on "moral and spiritual" values that seems to be the theme song of every public figure, is due to the belief that we must have been remiss somewhere in building the twentieth century American ideal. The implication is that if we could just ingraft these values, then the whole man, worthy to be praised in his own right, might emerge.

In a recent political campaign, a candidate was praised by one of his supporters as being a great man because "he was humble enough to pray to God for help." This inverted exaltation of man which is at least a small part of the return to religion in American life, is stimulated by the absence of visible eschatological hope in the Church.

There are, however, other segments of our culture that are profoundly apocalyptic.

One of the most obvious groups has been the group of atomic scientists who were shocked out of their indifference to the meaning of life by the terrible instruments of power they had created. It was both very moving and at the same time pathetic to hear those

voices from the laboratory in the late forties calling for responsible action in civic life, philosophical inquiry, and all the other necessary disciplines of society which they had so long ignored. Many of these men revealed an incredible naiveté about the complexities of human nature, but they were nobly prophetic in declaring the possible horror to which human sin could carry the world.

Contemporary literature and the arts have been increasingly obsessed with the apocalyptic in the last decades. While the Church was reflecting its peoples' interest in the down-to-earth practicalities of life, a new art and literature became more imaginative and more interior in its scope. The whole nonobjective movement in art, which is not to be universally praised as great art, nevertheless produced in the aesthetic realm affirmations of ultimate meaning not dependent on visual conformity to man's ideal of himself. The great moderns like Picasso both probe man's condition with honesty and glorify purity of form and movement which does not seem to be captive to his sin. And then there is Rouault, who alone among the great artists of our day, sees the contemporary drama of life and death in the light of the Christian view of the *eschaton*. In the *Miserere* series, he depicts the agony of Christ with such boldness that the Christian epic, today's agony, and tomorrow's resurrection are seen to be integrally re-

lated. He closes his preface to the portfolio of prints for the *Miserere* series with these poetic lines:

Form, color, harmony
Oasis or mirage
For the eyes, the heart, and the spirit
Toward the moving ocean of pictorial appeal

“Tomorrow will be beautiful,” said the shipwrecked man
Before he disappeared beneath the sullen horizon

Peace seems never to reign
Over this anguished world
Of shams and shadows

Jesus on the cross will tell you better than I,
Jeanne in her brief and sublime replies at her trial
As well as other saints and martyrs
Obscure or consecrated.²

Many novelists have dealt with apocalyptic themes in the past few years—deriving their vision not from a Christian view of the future, but generally by following out the worst implications they can see inherent in an industrialized and scientized culture. In many ways, such novels are profoundly Christian because the shock and horror they express at the dehumanization of men which they see coming to terrible tragedy at some

² *The Miserere of Georges Rouault*, copyright 1952 held by The Museum of Modern Art, distributed by Simon and Schuster, Inc., New York. By permission of The Museum of Modern Art.

future date is in response to the view of the perfect society in the Christian epic.

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and *1984*, Gore Vidal's *Messiah*, and Shepherd Mead's *Big Ball of Wax*, are among the best of a host of such novels.

Geddes MacGregor has produced a novel of this type with particular reference to the future of the Christian church, called *From a Christian Ghetto*.

Quite apart from these obviously apocalyptic novels, there are important strains within contemporary literature that are filled with eschatological meaning. The vogue of naturalism has almost completely disappeared in the last decade or two. Human relationships are probed for meanings and overtones that may reflect the universal and the ultimate without outlining a system or often even so much as declaring a belief in anything. It is almost that many contemporary writers, abhorring the shallowness of preached truth, want to catch it unaware, to come upon it in a relentless searching of the human heart and mind. The great writers, like Graham Greene, T. S. Eliot, W. H. Auden, Joyce Cary, who are quite obviously oriented toward the Christian faith, do this. So also do a number of younger writers who often seem on the surface to be telling weird stories of the distortion of human loneliness and longing. Carson McCullers, Jean Stafford, Flannery

O'Conner, Frederick Beuchner, J. D. Salinger, are people like this.

Existentialism has brought its own eschatological impact into literature, and also into the outlook of ordinary people with more effect than would at first seem to be true. The existentialist emphasis that all meaning is inherent in the living situation, though devoid of any intended religious content in the formulations of its pioneer writers like Sartre, is a close kin to Christian theology in its doctrine of time and history. Time and history are all wrapped up in this moment of existence, and for the secular existentialist, this means that there is no hope beyond the satisfaction of the moment. For the Christian it means that this moment, both its satisfactions and its frustration, has its final unassailable hope in Christ.

In 1956, a curious existentialist play, "Waiting for Godot," by Samuel Beckett, had a successful run on Broadway. For two acts, two philosophic hoboes on a bare stage discuss the frightening boredom of life while they are waiting for a mysterious Mr. Godot who has said he will come to them. Only this expected appearance has any interest for them. This is their only hope. He does not come, but sends word as he has done many times previous (through his son) that he will come tomorrow. The play is filled with the excruciating, finger nail-on-blackboard kind of dialogue that characterizes so much of existentialist writing. And yet

there is a hope—justified or unjustified, the author is not willing to say. The play represents a kind of stage in transition from doctrinaire existentialism toward the Christian hope. It is a play of serious power through which one feels the aching of the human heart for an assurance that can be believed of the coming of Christ's kingdom. No one who sees or reads the play will be able to believe afterward that a careful explication of Christian doctrine about how it is all going to be at the end of history, will meet the need. Eschatological hope has to be about the next breath as well as the next aeon.

One of the characters in "Waiting for Godot" is a wandering fat man named Pozzo, repulsive, pathetic, and yet strangely wise, who is at first taken by the hoboies to be Godot. In fact, it is even possible that he may have been and they did not know it. He appears in the first act, and again in the second, but in his last appearance he is blind. His exit speech is a clue to the mood of existentialism.

POZZO (suddenly furious): Have you not done tormenting me with your accursed time! It's abominable! When! When! One day, is that not enough for you, one day he went dumb, one day I went blind, one day we'll go deaf, one day we were born, one day we shall die, the same day, the same second, is that not enough for you? (Calmer.) They give birth astride of a grave,

the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more.
(He jerks the rope.) On! ³

This feeling of living deeply involved in human tragedy, yet under the sign of ultimate meaning is the mark of eschatological hope. It is not so often as apparent in the life of the Church as it is among those who feel disinherited by our society. It is the Church's loss, because it is essential to the gospel of the victorious Christ.

PRACTICE

It is well-nigh impossible to tell a church how to live with the fact that Christ has come and yet with the expectancy that the full Kingdom is yet to come. The repeated saying of it stimulates nothing but "So what?" after a time. Yet the church which does not live on this frontier misses the unique experience which is part of its strangeness.

At the risk of seeming too homiletically pat (the very curse of the eschatological hope), three attitudes might be said to be true of a Christian and a Christian people today who know the Kingdom not of this world and yet love the kingdom of the flesh.

The first is a *sense of outrage*. One might suppose that Christian love would come first, or at least preclude an emotion so strong as outrage. Christian love

³ P. 57, top of second page, "Waiting for Godot," by Samuel Beckett, copyright 1954 by Grove Press, New York. Used by permission.

can never really head the list of prescribed attitudes, for it cannot be reduced to code or exhausted in conduct. It is released in the affairs of men through the resting of their hope in God. And one of the observable results of that love is a burning sense of indignation against the encrusted, well-established evil of the world. Compassion for others cannot be severed from shock that human beings are trapped by sin and put upon by the ruthlessness of other men, sometimes the best-intentioned people in the world. There are so few things that shock us any more, or raise us to the point of speaking up when hypocrisy or cruelty is in the saddle. The realization that all men are sinners does not allow us the excuse of smiling indulgently and impartially upon bully and victim alike.

When the Christian loses the conviction that sham and phoniness, as well as cruelty, are worth striking against, then he has rationalized Christ's commendation of the childlike heart out of the gospel. If Christ is the Victor, then he cannot be mocked by our cheap sophistication which considers deceitfulness, public or private, as psychologically necessary. This does not necessarily mean that the church must take up the battle ax of Carrie Nation to rush out on crusades against the local gambling laws. The more important crusade is the one of blasting the pretensions of our time, foremost among them self-advertising public piety.

The church ought to be among other things a center of outrage against discrimination directed at any group of people and also against commercialized opinion manipulating. The voice from the pulpit has become less and less a voice of outrage. It has often become querulous complaint. "Thus saith the Lord," is strongly offensive to a people who believe that "This, thinks the minister," is the most that can be said. One is drawn back immediately to the earlier stress on the authority of the Word of God. The clean thrust of judgment which the gospel brings to oppose us at the times of our equivocation and wrestling must be expected in the church.

What is more, the community at large ought to expect it from the church. Churchmen are on public record about altogether too many petty issues—pet ones, at that, which are identified in the public mind as being inherent in the church lobby. Just as the veterans' lobby has an interest in relief to veterans, and the real estate lobby is opposed to public housing, so the Protestant church lobby has a vested interest in being against gambling (particularly Bingo), alcohol, and for separation of church and state. No one is surprised or very much influenced when bishops testify on these matters. But when Protestant churchmen speak out in controversial areas like political candidacy, housing, and civil rights, people do listen. A

sense of outrage marks the church's awareness of the Kingdom that is yet to come.

Closely allied to a sense of outrage, is the need for a *sense of humor*. Without it, even the justifiable outrage can easily become pomposity, one of the worst kinds of hypocrisy. To know when to fight and when to laugh is an art that the church might well learn. Unfortunately there are no "how to" books which are adequate to the task of helping a church stop taking itself so seriously in order that the gospel of the church can be felt with all its spontaneous effect.

Humor may well enough be a weapon against the pretensions of the world, but it is even more effectively a weapon against its own stuffiness. Satire on churchy habits and clerical innocence of the *New Yorker* type are wonderful antidotes to the self-enclosed world that it is so easy to create. This does not demean the intensely serious purpose of the church. Only cheap attempts to be cute or folksy can accomplish this. Such jokes are not really humor of the penetrating sort, since they are broad attempts to convince people that though we know the church is above human failure we want to make patronizing overtures to the common people. Devastating humor—humor that cuts us down to size, proclaims the real miracle of the incarnate Christ, he who never hesitated for a second to ask if an action was proper for a representative of divinity, but

in all humanity was one among many, and yet invincibly God all the time.

Such a freedom to laugh and to jest at our failure, and yet continue to act in ways that will invite another jest, is of the very essence of living in the grace of God. Life in the light of that grace is a continual series of attempts to put into practice the high purposes of the Kingdom, and a continual realization of how ludicrous the attempt often is. Such a life is saved from cynicism by the overriding sense of awe that all such attempts are redeemed to God's purpose in ways we had not planned or ever foreseen in our own wisdom.

Without a sense of the ludicrous, the consciousness of God's unfettered purposes can become dim. Personal satisfaction or personal failure and cynicism become the only alternatives.

Oliver St. John Gogarty, in his book of Irish reminiscences, *Start from Somewhere Else*, partially defines why a sense of humor is often a surer path to a knowledge of the Kingdom than anything else.

Laughter may be a sudden triumph; it is a sudden triumph when it becomes a triumph over life. When it proves, even for a second, that we have within us something of the immortals' courageous heart or mighty mind. Something that makes us spectators of life as if we were not in its arena. Laughter it is that differentiates us from the beasts and makes us superior to the beast within us.

Laughter enables us to see things under the aspect of Eternity.⁴

As companion of outrage and humor, a *sense of destiny* needs restoring to the church.

"An endless line of splendor, these troops with heaven for home," wrote Vachel Lindsay. How pallid we make our heritage and our destiny when we are tied too closely to decimal appraisals of this year's growth over last year's, or our failure to conform to the perfect image of clean-cut America at prayer.

Here we are, an American congregation at work and worship. We have come from our prefabricated houses in our late model Chevrolet. We have on our minds the threat of tomorrow's encounter with the boss over a "friendly" drink, and the problem of Junior's intransigent preference for sports cars to algebra.

And here we are, straight from an early morning seance with television's animated cartoons, and remembering a brush with Charlie, who made an insulting remark about our wife at the corner tavern last night.

And yet here we are, the called-out people of God, confident that though we know in part, such a little part, tomorrow we shall know fully, even as we are also known.

⁴ P. 187, *Start from Somewhere Else*, by Oliver St. John Gogarty. Copyright © 1955 by Oliver St. John Gogarty, reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Here as we hear the Word of God in all its mystery broken open for our health, we are one with that congregation who met in the back streets of Jerusalem. We are at Hippo in the last agonies of a dying civilization. We are in an unknown chapel in the backwoods, where our great, great-grandfather (whose name we may not ever know) heard the Scripture read. We are at the Last Judgment, with all the company of angels and of men, beholding in glory the Lamb upon the Throne.

No fear shall frighten us. No neurosis of this uncertain age shall turn us aside. We belong to the Kingdom whose Lord is Christ.

And He is "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A032404